

大成 DENTONS

Mary Ellen Bench
Counsel

maryellen.bench@dentons.com
D +1 416 863 4724

Dentons Canada LLP
77 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON, Canada M5K 0A1

dentons.com

March 8, 2022

File No.: 127446-628

Sent via email to: councilmeeting@toronto.ca

Ms. Marilyn Toft
Secretariat
City of Toronto
12th Floor, West Tower, City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

Dear Members of Council:

**Re: Canadian National Railway Company (“CN”)
Official Plan Amendment Pertaining to Development in Proximity to Rail Facilities – Final Report
Official Plan Amendment 536
Council Meeting March 9, 2022
Council Agenda Item: PH31.1**

We are counsel for CN with respect to the above noted matter. Kindly ensure that this correspondence is provided to the Council Members in advance of the Council meeting on March 9, 2022 at 9:30 a.m.

I am writing to you further to our letter (enclosed) that was provided to the Planning and Housing Committee, in advance of their meeting on February 15, 2022, and included as a communication received under agenda item PH31.1.

CN appreciates that the City of Toronto (the “City”) continues to be and has historically been vigilant in planning around rail facilities, in accordance with The Federation of Canadian Municipalities and The Railway Association of Canada Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway operations. As such, CN appreciates that the City continues to recognize the importance of careful consideration and planning in proximity to rail facilities, rail freight yards and rail rights-of-way.

CN continues to have comments and concerns regarding Official Plan Amendment 536 (“OPA 536”), with respect to the specifics of OPA 536. On behalf of our client, we attempted to arrange a meeting with City Staff to discuss and address these concerns, however, City Staff declined the meeting.

The enclosed letter summarizes our continued concerns in further detail.

Fernanda Lopes & Associados ► Guevara & Gutierrez ► Paz Horowitz Abogados ► Sirote ► Adepetun Caxton-Martins Agbor & Segun ► Davis Brown ► East African Law Chambers ► Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama ► Durham Jones & Pinegar ► LEAD Advogados ► Rattagan Macchiavello Arocena ► Jiménez de Aréchaga, Viana & Brause ► Lee International ► Kensington Swan ► Bingham Greenebaum ► Cohen & Grigsby ► Sayarh & Menjra ► For more information on the firms that have come together to form Dentons, go to [dentons.com/legacyfirms](https://www.dentons.com/legacyfirms)

We look forward to working with staff and Council Members to further address CN's concerns regarding OPA 536. CN continues to be of the opinion that a meeting with City Staff would be beneficial and we remain open to meet at Staff's convenience.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Dentons Canada LLP

DocuSigned by:
Mary Ellen Bench
50FD4EBF1970402...
Mary Ellen Bench
Counsel

MB/kv

Copy: Client

Enclosure: Letter to Planning and Housing Committee, February 15, 2022

大成 DENTONS

Katarzyna Sliwa
Partner
kat.sliwa@dentons.com
D +1 416 863 4628

Dentons Canada LLP
77 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON, Canada M5K 0A1

dentons.com

February 14, 2022

File No.: 127446-628

Sent via email to: phc@toronto.ca

Mr. John Elvidge
City Clerk, Planning and Housing Committee
10th Floor, West Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5C 2N2

Dear Mr. Elvidge:

**Re: Canadian National Railway Company (“CN”)
Official Plan Amendment Pertaining to Development in Proximity to Rail Facilities
Official Plan Amendment 536
Notice of Public Meeting on February 15, 2022 at 9:30 AM**

We are counsel for CN with respect to the above noted matter. Kindly ensure that this correspondence is provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting on February 15, 2022.

As you know, CN owns and operates a number of freight rail yards (including intermodal terminals) located throughout the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area, with railway lines, which run through the City of Toronto (the “**City**”). These railway lines and freight yards are used to support the frequent bulk transfer of cargo, including dangerous goods, throughout Canada. The rail lines include connections to the MacMillan Yard, being one of the largest rail freight yards in North America. In addition, where CN has divested of rail lines to other operators, CN often maintains “running rights” to carry freight on those lines when needed to serve customers.

CN appreciates that the City continues to recognize the importance of careful consideration and planning in proximity to rail facilities, rail freight yards and rail right-of-ways. CN acknowledges and appreciates that the City has historically been vigilant in planning around rail facilities in accordance with The Federation of Canadian Municipalities and The Railway Association of Canada Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations (the “**FCM-RAC Guidelines**”).

On behalf of CN, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the City Initiated Official Plan Amendment 536 (“**OPA 536**”) which addresses development in proximity to rail facilities. CN has

Fernanda Lopes & Asociados ▶ Guevara & Gutierrez ▶ Paz Horowitz Abogados ▶ Sirote ▶ Adepetun Caxton-Martins Agbor & Segun ▶ Davis Brown ▶ East African Law Chambers ▶ Eric Silwamba, Jalasi and Linyama ▶ Durham Jones & Pinegar ▶ LEAD Advogados ▶ Rattagan Macchiavello Arocena ▶ Jiménez de Aréchaga, Viana & Brause ▶ Lee International ▶ Kensington Swan ▶ Bingham Greenebaum ▶ Cohen & Grigsby ▶ Sayarh & Menjra ▶ For more information on the firms that have come together to form Dentons, go to [dentons.com/legacyfirms](https://www.dentons.com/legacyfirms)

NATDOCS\61095979\V-5

reviewed the Development in Proximity to Rail: Amendment to the Official Plan – Final Report, dated January 27, 2022, and draft OPA 536, and has the following comments:

1. The text in Section 3.6 Rail Facilities and Public Safety (*unshaded text*) references the appropriate separation of uses from rail facilities, and the provision and construction of risk mitigation design solutions on site, such as crash walls or structures. This reference could be strengthened by including “prohibiting sensitive land uses in certain circumstances”, to highlight that sensitive uses should not be located within proximity to rail facilities, including rail right-of-ways. This is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (the “**PPS 2020**”) and the FCM-RAC Guidelines and would ensure that when certain sensitive uses are permitted within proximity to a rail facility, the site is properly mitigated and safety concerns are appropriately addressed. It would also recognize that not every site is appropriate for sensitive land uses near rail facilities.
2. Although Policy 1 of OPA 536 speaks to land uses within the area of influence, it does not define what is considered the ‘area of influence’. The policy should include reference to a one (1) kilometer area of influence from rail freight yards and a three hundred (300) metre area of influence from a rail right-of-way.
3. As commenting agencies under the *Planning Act*, rail operators are circulated on all proposed development applications within proximity to rail facilities. In policy 2 “reviewed by the applicable rail operator” should be changed to “reviewed and comments satisfactorily addressed by the applicable rail operator”.
4. With regard to the third policy, CN appreciates that the City has included clear reference to the FCM-RAC Guidelines. The FCM-RAC Guidelines are also applicable to plans of condominium and consent to sever applications, and as such, this section should be amended to clearly reflect this. These types of applications are required to be evaluated against the criteria established in the FCM-RAC Guidelines, when in proximity to rail facilities, inclusive of rail right-of-way.
5. Section 3.6 Rail Facilities and Public Safety (*unshaded text*) should be revised to include land use compatibility and land uses near rail facilities. In particular, this section should include requirements in accordance with policy 1.2.6 of the PPS 2020.

As you know, policy 1.2.6 Land Use Compatibility of the PPS 2020 requires an assessment, where avoidance of a sensitive land use in proximity to a major facility is not possible, of whether there is an identified need for the proposed use and whether alternative locations for the proposed use have been considered and there are no reasonable alternative locations for the use. The PPS 2020 strives to ensure that major facilities and sensitive land uses are planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, to minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety and to ensure the long term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures. The current draft

of OPA 536 does not respond to the PPS 2020 requirement for examining 'needs and alternatives'. The requirement should be considered and included in OPA 536.

We look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the City to address the above considerations. Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Dentons Canada LLP

DocuSigned by:
Kat Sliwa
A3752F1427A64A8...
Katarzyna Sliwa
Partner

KS/kv

Copy: Client