ATTACHMENT 1

Goodmans LLP

Barristers & Solicitors

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

Telephone: 416.979.2211
Facsimile: 416.979.1234
goodmans.ca

Direct Line: +1(416)597-4136
rgill@goodmans.ca

August 26, 2026

Our File No.: 260438

Via Email (RegistrarCCO@toronto.ca)

Registrar Secretariat
City Clerk's Office
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario, M5H 2N2

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: 55 Elm Street (Entrance Address 650 Bay Street) – Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate a Property under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act

We are the solicitors for Bay Elm 650 Inc. (our "**Client**"), the owner of the property known municipally as 55 Elm Street (entrance address 650 Bay Street, the "**Property**"), the subject of a Notice of Intention to Designate a Property under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act (the "**Act**") dated August 4, 2026 (the "**Notice of Intention**"). Please accept this letter as our Client's notice of objection to the Notice of Intention and request that City Council amend the statement of significance to provide clarity before passing a designation by-law for the Property under Part IV, Section 29 of the Act.

Adequate Description of the Property

Pursuant to subsection 29(4)(a) of the Act, a notice of intention to designate a property under Part IV of the Act shall contain an adequate description of the property so that it may be readily ascertained. While the City staff report and City Council's decision make it clear that the Property is the subject of the Notice of Intention, the statement of significance in the Notice of Intention is less clear. Under the heading "Description", the first paragraph refers to a row of house-form buildings at 57-65 Elm Street. Our Client finds this confusing as City Council has only given direction to deliver a notice of intention with respect to the Property.

Our Client respectfully requests that the statement of significance and any designating by-law make it perfectly clear that the Property is the only land that is the subject of the designation. More specifically, our Client requests that the "Description" of property required by subsection 29(4)(a) only refer to the Property.

Heritage Attributes

Under the heading "Contextual Value", the Notice of Intention provides, among other things:

The following heritage attributes contribute to the cultural heritage value of the subject property as being visually and historically linked to its surroundings:

- The setback, placement and orientation of the building on its lot at the southwest corner of Bay and Elm streets, and abutting the historically associated, Ward-era house-form buildings at 57-71 Elm Street

[Underlining Added]

Our Client considers the reference to the properties at 57-71 Elm Street within a heritage attribute for the Property to be problematic. While the contextual value of the Property is informed by properties on Elm Street and the Ward more generally, our Client sees no relationship between the Property and those at 57-71 Elm Street as creating a heritage attribute that is able to be identified as such in a designation by-law. Our Client has no objection with the remainder of the above noted heritage attribute that has not been underlined.

Conclusion

Our Client requests that the City amend the Notice of Intention's statement of significance as provided for in this letter and ensure that the proposed designation by-law reflect those amendments.

Yours truly,

Goodmans LLP



Rodney Gill
Partner
RG/nb
1390-4167-8882