



99 Yorkville Avenue  
Suite 200  
Toronto, ON M5R 3K5

T: 416-932-0136  
E: [ian@flettlaw.ca](mailto:ian@flettlaw.ca)  
[www.flettlaw.ca](http://www.flettlaw.ca)

December 15, 2025

Mr. John Elvidge

City Clerk  
City of Toronto  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Your Worship and Members of Council;

**Re: Item 2025.TE27.26  
38–50 Park Road – Applications for Official Plan Amendment and  
Zoning By-law Amendment  
On behalf of York Condominium Corporation No. 168 (66 Collier  
Street)**

We write on behalf of York Condominium Corporation No. 168, the residential condominium located immediately west of the subject site at 66 Collier Street.

At the outset, our client wishes to thank City Planning staff for the thorough and careful analysis set out in the Decision Report recommending refusal of this application. The report reflects a clear understanding of the site's constraints, its sensitive context at the edge of the Rosedale Valley, and the importance of applying the Downtown Plan and Official Plan policies with discipline rather than exception.

Our client supports and endorses the staff recommendation that Council refuse the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.

The concerns identified by staff regarding land use designation, height, massing, transition, heritage impacts, ravine adjacency, and public realm conditions are directly aligned with the experience of residents who live near the site. In particular, the

conclusion that a 31-storey tower does not fit the existing or planned context of this location accords with both common sense and the applicable planning framework.

To better understand the implications of the proposal, our client has retained an independent urban designer to review the development in its physical and policy context. That professional opinion is consistent with the conclusions reached by City staff, namely that the site lacks the size, configuration, and surrounding conditions necessary to accommodate a tall building while providing appropriate transition to neighbouring low-rise areas, parkland, and the Rosedale Valley ravine system.

In addition, our client is in the process of consulting with a transportation engineering firm to better understand existing traffic conditions and deficiencies in the area.

Residents already experience dangerous and arresting congestion along Park Road between Rosedale Valley Road and Church Street, particularly during peak periods. The constrained width, steep grades, and function of Park Road as a critical north-south access route amplify these conditions. The introduction of construction traffic and long-term servicing demands associated with a tower of this scale raises serious safety and operational concerns.

Our client also notes that its concerns are not isolated. Numerous residents, ratepayer groups, and neighbouring property owners have submitted correspondence objecting to the proposal on planning, heritage, traffic, and livability grounds. Taken together, these submissions demonstrate broad and consistent concern within the community most directly affected by this development.

In our respectful submission, this is precisely the type of application for which the Downtown Plan and Official Plan provide clear limits. Upholding those limits in this case will reinforce confidence in the City's planning framework and in the integrity of Council's decision-making.

For these reasons, York Condominium Corporation No. 168 urges City Council to adopt the staff recommendation and refuse the applications.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

**IAN FLETT  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION**

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ian Flett", written in a cursive style.

**Ian Flett**

C: Client  
Councillor Saxe