

January 17, 2024

**By E-Mail Only to *Christy.Chow@toronto.ca***

Christy Chow, Community Planner  
City of Toronto  
Toronto City Hall  
City Planning Division City Hall, 18th Floor, East Tower  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5H 2N2

Dear Ms. Chow:

**Re: Planning Applications for 85-89 Queen Street East and 119-127 Church Street (the “Subject Lands”)  
City File Nos. 22 186084 STE 13 OZ and 22 186083 STE 13 SA**

We are counsel to Marrelli Capital Limited, the owner of land municipally known as 82 Richmond Street East (the “**Property**”), located east of Church Street, and south of Ditty Lane.

On August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, CCD 119 Church Limited Partnership (the “**Applicant**”) submitted a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment application and a Site Plan Approval application (the “**Applications**”) to permit a mixed-use development with an 8-storey podium and 60-storey tower rising above, 701 residential units, ground floor commercial uses and service vehicle loading/access off of Ditty Lane (the “**Initial Proposal**”). On behalf of our client, we conveyed our clients concerns with the Initial Proposal in a letter to the City on November 7, 2022.

On November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023, the Applicant submitted a revised Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a mixed-use development including a 59-storey tower rising above, 690 residential units, ground floor commercial uses and service vehicle loading/access off of Ditty Lane (the “**Revised Proposal**”).

The purpose of this letter is to provide our client’s concerns regarding the Revised Proposal, which largely reiterate our prior concerns.

Our client is primarily concerned about the impact the Revised Proposal will have on their use of Ditty Lane both during, and post-construction. At only 4.3 metres wide at its narrowest point, and with only one entrance/exit, it does not appear that Ditty Lane is wide

enough to permit two-way traffic at times when the Subject Lands are being serviced by Type C and G vehicles. This continues to be a major concern and there does not appear to be a draft Construction Management Plan filed to assess how, or if, this concern can be mitigated.

Additionally, the Applications do not disclose whether Ditty Lane will be blocked off or inaccessible during construction. For clarity, Ditty Lane serves as vehicular access to the below grade garage located on the Property which our client and its tenants utilize daily. Ditty Lane also acts as an emergency exit route from the rear of the Property, and it is not clear how, or if, access to this emergency exit route will be maintained if the Applications are approved.

We are also concerned about the proposed reduced tower setback of 10.0 metres from the centre line of Ditty Lane as opposed to the required 12.5 metres. In order to ensure adequate separation distances between the Revised Proposal and any potential future development on the Property, and to maintain privacy, it would be prudent to comply with the 12.5 metre setback requirement.

We ask that the City seriously consider our clients legitimate concerns.

We kindly request that we be added to the notice circulation list and that we be provided with notice of future public, councillor-initiated and Council meetings related to the Applications, together with any/all City staff reports. We also request notice of any decisions that may arise respecting the Applications.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours truly,  
**DAVIES HOWE LLP**



Andy Margaritis

AM:km