



March 9, 2025

To: Councillor Kandavel

CC: Lou Di Gironimo, Jennifer Graham Harkness, Christian Ventresca, Janet May, Dan Tadenc, Paul Vincent, Yvonne Di Tullio, Grace Tessa, Adrian Molder

**RE: 3291 KINGSTON RD/2-4 WINDY RIDGE DR - Rezoning Application Number: 20209863ESC200Z**

Dear Councillor Kandavel,

A string of emails, captured below in our October 25, 2025 follow up, reflect much effort in trying to engage with the City Staff in our attempts to find answers to important questions prior to rezoning. In response to these concerns the City advised, **“it will be addressed at site plan review.”** and/or **“the studies are satisfactory for the purpose of rezoning”**

It has come to our attention that this site is speeding to begin putting shovels in the ground by end of year (2026) in order to remain eligible for Federal grants for what is now planned to be a purpose-built rental building. There is a hold on the approval for rezoning for this application that is contingent on the City being satisfied with the transportation services study, the hydrogeology study and Arborist Report.

With regards to the Site Plan Agreement (“SPA”) application documents now being circulated, we have again reviewed reports, comments and City responses regarding the application for 3291 Kingston Road development, and we wish to communicate to you that there remain important questions and concerns about the engineering, fire services, solid waste management, stormwater management, and urban design that remain unanswered and not addressed. In addition, some of the City’s comments are contrary to the agreements between LCH Development and Parties, which we also describe below.

Concerned residents are asking for replies to the many outstanding questions as well as where the names and emails of the City Engineers that will be signing off on the approval of this development can be found.

#### **Transportation Services Review:**

#### **How is it possible that all of Toronto Transportation Services requirements and requests have been satisfied?**

Our previous follow ups highlight that report details are based on **2010 extrapolated data** (essentially a guess) with missing critical end of day school dismissal hour period. Furthermore, the Traffic System Operation Group provided several comments on the Transportation Addendum Report, including the need for signal timing adjustments and the inclusion of specific intersections in the traffic analysis. Recommendations included implementing a fully protected westbound left-turn phase at key intersections and submitting traffic signal control plans.

**The quality of the transportation study is a HUGE concern to residents and the RA requests to be involved in further work to make this intersection and segment of Kingston Road safe for cars, students/pedestrians, and bicycles by ensuring that the update transportation plans include these adjustments.**

- "Inclusion of Specific Intersections" seems to imply that the initial study area was too small and "impacted intersections" will have traffic spill over, likely major bottlenecks far from the site, and that intersections with existing safety/congestion issues. **Have additional study locations be identified to show how they are impacted? What impact will the median on Kingston Road (that prevents a left turn from Kingston Rd.**

into the main condo entrance and left turn out of the main condo entrance) have with regards to U-turns and pushing traffic on local side streets?

- "Fully Protected Westbound Left-Turn Phase" Our understanding is this is usually requested to eliminate high-collision turning movements. **Is there concern that although this will reduce turning accidents, it can reduce overall intersection efficiency during off-peak hours? Will this push traffic to take shortcuts through local streets.**
- "Submitting Traffic Signal Control Plans" **Has the City assessed if the proposed development will push key intersections beyond their current safe or functional capacity, requiring improvements to maintain flow and safety? How will the City ensure the development-related congestion does not worsen existing traffic problems? as well are there "For Construction" drawings available for review?**
- **Will the "DO NOT BLOCK" sign at the entrance of Windy Ridge remain as is?** This is a clear indicator that this is a complicated intersection at the entrance of Windy Ridge and the sign has been put in place help avoid traffic obstructions. Cross traffic from Gas Station to make a right onto Kingston, or to straight through to Windy Ridge, cars from Kingston Road attempt to make a left into Windy Ridge, and cars exit Windy Ridge to get into the left turn lane onto Kingston Road etc. **Where can we find details that consider the complicated 5-point intersection, the school, bus stop and gas station on the south west corner?**
- **Where can we find where the now "approved" city proposed bike lane on Kingston Rd. is being considered and how it will impact parking and traffic flow on Kingston Road?**
- Our records and previous follow ups capture that City Engineering Lou Di Gironimo & Jennifer Graham Harkness City Chief Stormwater engineer agreed at a meeting with RA and Councillor that ditches are good for storm water control and provide soak away for the storm water into the ground. To not have the sidewalk was also a settlement condition with the applicant. As well, the filling in of the ditch will have a negative impact the existing boulevard tree's roots system. **Please confirm that the 2.1-meter sidewalk along Windy Ridge Drive extending along the property, which has been added again for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time by City Planning, will be removed?**
- On December 18, 2020, John McKenzie confirmed that TRCA had taken note of parking concerns and would flag trail access and **parking considerations as important issues** of consideration with the planning lead at the City. As well, the Environmental Assessment for the Scarborough Waterfront Project specifically acknowledges the lack of parking at the Doris McCarthy Trail entrance (s.4.3.2 of its executive summary, s 2.5.2.2. of main body and others). Despite many attempts to bring this to Christian Ventresca's attention, we do not see where concerns have been addressed. **Please advise where parking and overflow concerns were considered?**

#### **Fire Services Review:**

- **We do not see where Fire department access in the courtyard interior is achieved?**

#### **Solid Waste Management Services:**

- The applicant indicated a revised area of 100 square meters. **Where can we find revised drawings showing a garbage storage room of at least 111.58 square meters?**

#### **Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management / Hydrogeological Investigation:**

- New comments indicate that adjustments were made to ensure compliance with water quality control device sizing and groundwater discharge requirements. According to Hydrogeological Investigation, prepared by Fisher Engineering, dated May 23, 2025, found in Appendix B of the FSR-SWM Report, long-term groundwater quality meets Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 681, therefore, no treatment is required. FSR-SWM has been revised to state that no treatment is required. **The previous report says treatment is needed, how is this possible?**
- The report was updated to reflect accurate calculations and compliance with city standards. **Can you point us to what and where the updates were made? As well, if there were changes to City Standards?**

- The applicant confirmed that the stormwater tank will utilize gravity for drainage, eliminating the need for a pump system. It is our understanding that this is possible because the number of parking levels have been reduced, therefore not needing pumping up to the city stormwater drains. However, we understand the developer is considering geothermal system which would be placed below the parking level. **Is tanking still possible?**
- Back in 2022 we suggested further study and analysis be performed by a specialist Geotechnical firm like McMillan Jacobs Associates. There was concern of sandy/silt soil may result in sink holes and of the rising ground water table impact to adjacent homes' structures and Kingston Rd. and utilities services. We can not rely on developers reports to adequately assess risk and asked that the City be proactive in understanding impact. Only studies conducted by the City or City's consultants can objectively determine potential impacts of development applications. **Can you please confirm the name of the engineer that will be signing off on this approval so that we can ask them to consider again our request in the attached letter?**  
[https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/Geotechnical-Concerns-3291-KINGSTON-RD\\_2-4-WINDY-RIDGE-DR.pdf](https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/Geotechnical-Concerns-3291-KINGSTON-RD_2-4-WINDY-RIDGE-DR.pdf)

### Site Servicing and Grading Plans:

- The City of Toronto regulates for stormwater for new developments, requiring the management of stormwater runoff to be within and on-site, not onto adjacent properties. LCH must revise the drainage plan to restrict stormwater runoff to within the subject site, while guaranteeing that the boundary trees are not damaged. **Please confirm where we can find details that guarantee the boundary trees will not be damaged?**
- The Site Servicing Plan was revised to indicate the type and model of quality control devices and confirm pipe materials for existing sewers. The Site Grading Plan addressed stormwater management, confirming that all storm flows will be stored in the proposed underground tank, with no ponding expected during a 100-year storm event. Adjustments were made to capture stormwater runoff from the ramp to the underground parking, ensuring compliance with city guidelines. **Isn't the 100-year storm standard outdated?** Toronto has experienced at least four storms in the last 20 years (2005, 2013, 2018, and July 2024) that met or exceeded the 100-year rainfall threshold.
- On Dec 10, 2025 Mr. Khan provided the following reply to one of our questions submitted with regards to Basement Flooding Studies. We have included our comments in red?
  - Are located in different sanitary sewer shed from 3291 Kingston site. The 3291 Kingston site discharges the proposed sanitary flow to the existing sanitary sewer draining west. **correct but it then gets pumped to north not all to west** The above 4 developments sites discharge to the existing sanitary sewer to the east. **incorrect 11 Bellamy Rd Dev & 3291 Kingston Rd both developments sanitary flow north does not** Therefore, the 4 development sites have no impacts to the downstream sewers from the 3291 Kingston site, as they are different sewers. **Not correct 3291 Kingston road add the overcapacity sanitary sewer west of Ravine Dr. Plus add to overcapacity pump station and lines north. per following plan.** (see image on page 8)
- Mr. Khan advised that most of our other questions were "not related to the scope of review of his unit" I include the remaining questions captured in our October 31, 2024 follow up so they can be responded to prior to Site Plan Approval. <https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSWRA-Letter-re-Area-52-and-59-Flooding-Team-November-21-2025.pdf>
- Urban Forestry's did **NOT** support the application as summarized in the below February 2022 report as it did not demonstrate compliance with Tier 1 of TGS Version 3 (ecology section) and that significant changes need to be made to address this combined issue of excessive tree removal and insufficient tree replacement. **Where has the impact of loosing 76 (RC or R) water absorbing mature trees (located directly in a significant migratory route for wildlife) been considered? Can you summarize what "significant changes" were made to address the excessive tree loss?**

## Segment Study:

- The applicant is required to submit **QUALITY** investigative reports and studies and to take into consideration nearby proposals and cumulative impacts. Materials reflected in the AIC, in particular the Avenue Segment Review, City Staff indicate they are not satisfied, per comments provided from ECS. **Where are the report/details (or equivalent) that considers cumulative impacts and how can city staff put forward a recommendation to council to approve this rezoning without this study?**
- The Natural Heritage study submitted by the developer dated November 19, 2021 is brief, incomplete, lacks detail and supportive evidence and is not in keeping with previous TRCA studies and makes no reference to them. Chapter 3.4 outlines 25 Policies pertaining to development on or near lands shown as part of the natural heritage system on Map 9 which again includes the Scarborough Bluffs, Doris McCarthy Trail and Bellamy Ravine extending to the corner of Kingston Road and Windy Ridge Drive. **Show us where we can find the details that support that Chapter 3.4 has been considered?**
  - le. Page 2 notes Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) records several species at risk within the 2 -1 km squares that includes the property, but the report states these occurrences are likely associated with the Bellamy Ravine and Bluffs. This is pure speculation, **do birds know to just fly in the ravine?** They use the existing road, gas station and houses that the setback is sufficient to prevent any negative impacts. No evidence, and then go on to say there should be an erosion sediment control plan, as a minimum erosion control fencing should be installed around the perimeter of the work area. As a minimum? What does this mean? **A fence is going to prevent erosion?**
  - **The report is pure speculation, show us where we can find the evidence to support it?**

## Demolition, Staging & Construction:

- Currently, there is a five-point intersection at Ravine, Kingston Road and Windy Ridge, a well-used gas station, bus stop as well parents are parking on Windy Ridge to pick up students. As such many concerns have been raised about staging of equipment and work for this condo development. **We would like to learn more about this stage and how staging equipment, labourer parking area, dump truck staging for excavated soil, student safety pedestrian safety, noise and vibration pollution will be managed? Do neighbours need to be concerned about vibrations and possible impact to foundations?**
- **Where on the City details can residents see that this development will now be a purpose-built rental building? How will residents be notified of this change? The most recent reports found on the AIC today are dated 2025-09-04, are these the most recent reports available for review? As well, please share any new updates added to the tracking sheet, the version that was shared with us is dated June 2025.**

While the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) approved the amendment **in principle** in November 2023, the final order is being withheld until ALL conditions are met. The communities' concerns can not be pushed off again and should not be rushed to meet timelines.

We understand the applicant is expected to continue addressing comments and refining plans to meet city requirements and standards including the finalizing technical reports for stormwater, hydrogeology, and traffic.

As a formal party we look forward to working together moving forward with a common goal to ensure that the best possible outcome can be achieved for the neighbourhood and community.

Please confirm receipt of this email and what next steps will be with regards to getting replies to the questions submitted in our letter.

Best regards,  
Marina Tadenc  
Director, on behalf of the Board of Directors  
Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents Association

Following are links to correspondence with MORE QUESTIONS that still need to be addressed for which we were told would be addressed at site plan review:

November 2024, <https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSWRA-Letter-re-document-review-of-OLT-precondition-for-3291-Kingston-Road-24-Windy-Ridge-Development-October-2024.pdf>

September 30, 2024,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSW-Follow-up-questions-to-Toronto-Engineering-re-3291-Kingston-Road-24-Windy-Ridge-Development.pdf>

and July 31, 2024,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/Follow-up-to-Toronto-Engineerin-Meeting-July-24-2024-re-3291-Kingston-Rd..pdf>

Also included for your reference is the presentation by Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents Association May 23, 2023 meeting with Lou Di Gironimo, Jennifer Graham Harkness, and Councillor Kandavel,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSWRA-Presentation-May-23-2024-Toronto-Engineering-Meeting-re-3291-Kingston-Rd.pdf>



October 25, 2025

To: Councillor Kandavel,

CC: Lou Di Gironimo, Jennifer Graham Harkness, Christian Ventresca, Janet May, Dan Tadenc, Paul Vincent, Yvonne Di Tullio, Grace Tessa, Adrian Molder

**RE: Follow Up to November 11, 2024, - 3291 KINGSTON RD/2-4 WINDY RIDGE DR - Rezoning Application Number: 20209863ESC200Z**

Councillor Kandavel,

With regards to circulation of the Site Plan Agreement (“SPA”) application documents, we have discovered again by chance that a detailed revision list and revision list letter for the Site Plan Agreement has been uploaded to the AIC as of September 4<sup>th</sup> 2025 in the Zoning folder.

<https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-details/?id=5039830&pid=52117&title=3291%20KINGSTON%20RD>

As well, our records show no response to concerns/questions shared in our previous November 11, 2024 correspondence, including Hydrogeological Report discrepancy, Removal existing ditch on Windy Ridge Dr. + Tree impact, Transportation Impact Study, and more. With the project Site Plan Agreement (SPA) application currently under review we are resubmitting our unanswered questions and concerns to ensure they are addressed.

See link for:

November 2024 follow up,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSWRA-Letter-re-docuent-review-of-OLT-precondition-for-3291-Kingston-Road-24-Windy-Ridge-Development-October-2024.pdf>

And September 30, 2024,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSW-Follow-up-questions-to-Toronto-Engineering-re-3291-Kingston-Road-24-Windy-Ridge-Development.pdf>

and July 31, 2024 follow ups,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/Follow-up-to-Toronto-Engineerin-Meeting-July-24-2024-re-3291-Kingston-Rd..pdf> and

Presentation by Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents Association May 23, 2023 meeting with Lou Di Gironimo, Jennifer Graham Harkness, Councillor Kandavel,

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/data/documents/CSVSWRA-Presentation-May-23-2024-Toronto-Engineering-Meeting-re-3291-Kingston-Rd.pdf>

To help understand better what is currently under review the CSVSWRA also requests to receive:

- **the current and most recent** City comments with regards to preapproval conditions outlined and those yet to be satisfied
- Including **response tracking sheet** with City comments and supporting reports mentioned

As a formal party we hope that we can work together moving forward with a common goal to ensure that the best possible outcome can be achieved for the neighbourhood and community.

We look forward to your reply.

Best regards,

Marina Tadenc

Director, on behalf of the Board of Directors

Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents Association

<https://cliffcrestscarboroughvillagesw.ca/about-us>

Mr. Khans reply to us on capacity is still not fully addressed, see our comments in Red captured in our follow up:



DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS	# Storeys	# of units		# Resident				# Parking Spaces			
		Total Units	Town Homes	Est. Residents	High limit	School/Daycare Potential	% Children	Total Parking	Resident Parking	Estimated St. Parking	Bicycles
3291 Kingston Rd., 2 & 4 Windy Ridge Dr.	12	320		608	846	198	23%	202	182	42	266
34 Annis Road, 3355, 3357, 3365 Kingston Rd.	12	309	18	590	800	198	25%	318	271	17	228
27 & 29 Parkcrest	4		144	357	486	198	41%	137	122	0	109
5, 7, 9, 11 Bellamy Rd. S	4		115	400	502	272	54%	73	67	14	94
3310 3312 3314 Kingston Rd.	11	323		427	521	118	23%	292	243	0	262
(Proposed on Toronto AIC) TOTAL		952	277	2382	3155	984	31%	1022	885		959



Parks, Forestry & Recreation  
Janie Ramoff, General Manager

Urban Forestry  
Scarborough District  
150 Borough Dr. 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M1P 4N7

### Memorandum

Janice Allen, Supervisor  
Tree Protection & Plan Review  
Tel: 416-396-5131  
Fax: 416-396-4170  
Email: [Janice.Allen@toronto.ca](mailto:Janice.Allen@toronto.ca)

DATE: February 28, 2022

TO: Paul Zullani, Director, Community Planning, Scarborough District  
Attention: **Rory McNeil**  
Telephone: 416-394-5683 Email: [Rory.McNeil@toronto.ca](mailto:Rory.McNeil@toronto.ca)

FROM: Janice Allen, Supervisor, Tree Protection & Plan Review, Scarborough District  
Attention: **Amanda Puopolo**  
Telephone: 416-338-5056 Email: [Amanda.Puopolo@toronto.ca](mailto:Amanda.Puopolo@toronto.ca)

RE: **Application for Approval of Plans: 3291 Kingston Rd/2-4 Windy Ridge Dr  
Official Plan Amendment  
Zoning By-Law Amendment Application No. 20 209863 ESC 20 OZ**

This memo acknowledges receipt of your revised Request for Comments circulated on January 12, 2022, regarding the above noted OPA and OZ applications which propose the development of an 11-storey residential building containing 309 dwelling units and a total GFA of 20,983.9 m<sup>2</sup>. A total of 287 vehicle parking spaces and 233 bicycle parking spaces are proposed.

The information below represents comments from Urban Forestry TPR (Tree Protection & Plan Review), with respect to the City Street Tree By-law and the Private Tree By-law, Municipal Code Chapter 813, Trees, Articles II and III. These comments do not include those of Urban Forestry's Ravine & Natural Feature Protection (RNFP) branch.

The following plans and reports were reviewed:

- Architectural Plans, prepared by RAW Design, revision dated December 9, 2021
- Civil Plans, prepared by Lithos Group Inc., revision no. 2, dated December 14, 2021
- Arborist Report, prepared by Jon Woodside Arborist, dated September 17, 2020 and revised October 22, 2021
- Tree Protection Plan, prepared by Adesso Design Inc., revision no. 8, dated December 15, 2021
- Landscape Plans, prepared by Adesso Design Inc., revision no. 8, dated December 15, 2021
- Toronto Green Standard Version 3- Checklist and Statistics Template

Toronto's urban forest plays an important role in making Toronto a clean and beautiful city. Trees significantly enhance all new development and renewal projects, enhancing both the quality and value of our environment. The City's Official Plan recommends policies that have been adopted by City Council that call for an increase in the amount of tree canopy coverage. City Council has adopted the objective of increasing the existing 28 percent tree canopy coverage to 40 percent. The planting of large growing shade trees on both public and private lands should be an important

objective for all development projects. The early co-ordination of utilities and other infrastructure elements with the soil volume and air space required to permit the growth of large growing trees is particularly important. Suitable conditions for tree planting must be considered integral to the design, planning, and construction of all development projects.

#### Official Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application No. 20 209863 ESC 20 OZ:

**Urban Forestry is not opposed in principle to development of this site, however at this time we do not support the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment proposal, because aspects of the overall plan/concept for the site are, in Urban Forestry's opinion, inconsistent with parts of the City's Official Plan and council's objectives concerning tree canopy cover (summarized above), and do not demonstrate compliance with Tier 1 of TGS Version 3 (ecology section).**

Specifically:

1. **At the earliest stages of design, special attention should be given to the retention and protection of existing (healthy) mature trees, located on City road allowance or private property, over the planting of new/replacement trees, as large mature trees provide significantly greater contributions (e.g. environmental, community benefits) than new or small trees.**
2. Tree by-laws to protect and preserve trees on City and private property have been established in order to attempt to retain as much crown cover as possible, particularly where development is concerned. **It is expected that retention and appropriate protection of existing trees will be considered when developing site plans, and whenever possible, buildings and driveways are to be diverted around trees. As proposed, this project would require the removal of all but three (3) By-Law protected trees on the subject site.** In total, it would require the removal of thirty-six (36) By-law protected privately owned trees, located on the subject site and two or three (inconsistent between plans) City street trees, located adjacent to Windy Ridge Dr., including a Silver maple tree of 101cm in diameter. In addition, it would require the injury of one (1) City street tree and three (3) private (neighbour/boundary) trees.
  - a) **Urban Forestry finds this unacceptable. Large-growing, long-lived shade trees, particularly those on City property and the outer edges of the site, should have every effort made for their retention.**
  - b) **Under this proposal, there is a net canopy loss, with at least 36 by-law protected trees being proposed for removal (in addition to dozens of undersized trees) and only 21 new trees being proposed. Significant changes need to be made to address this combined issue of excessive tree removal and insufficient tree replacement.**
3. Prior to approval of any zoning bylaw amendment application, the applicant should be required to demonstrate that they can comply with all elements of the city's Toronto Green Standards, including the parts of the ecology section, which pertain to existing and proposed trees.
4. Buildings and underground building structures (eg. parking garage) should be designed and built with sufficient setbacks from the property lines, proposed and existing public and private

### 3.3 Permit to Take Water (PTTW)

As the calculated groundwater dewatering flowrate is more than 50 m<sup>3</sup>/day, registration on the MOEC Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) for Water Taking will be required. Application for permission to take water (PTTW) is not required as the daily flowrate is less than 400,000 litres.



Fisher Engineering Ltd  
Project No. 20-10062-H September 8, 2020

#### 7.4 Groundwater Quality

The results of analyses for groundwater quality under the Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681, Sewers, By-Law No. 100-2016, Table 1 – Limits for Sanitary and Combined Discharge and Table 2 – Limits for Storm Sewer Discharge show compliance with all parameters except as listed in Table 5.

Table 5: Results from Sewer Use Bylaw tests

Parameters	Guide Limits		Results
	Table 1 (Sanitary Sewer)	Table 2 (Storm Sewer)	
Total suspended solids, mg/L	350	15	3.8
Phosphorus, mg/L	10	0.4	0.96
Manganese, mg/L	5	0.05	0.154

Based on the results, presented in Table 5, pre-treatment of the groundwater will be required prior to discharging to the storm sewer system. The groundwater, in its present form, can be discharged to the public sanitary system without treatment.

It should be noted however that testing of groundwater at the depths observed during the investigation would not be representative of the water that might accumulate during a high rainfall event. Any accumulation of precipitation occurring in the excavation during construction, that may require offsite discharge, will have to be tested at the time of the event to determine the quality of water for discharge.

## MyTree Benefits



Tree Collection Totals, 0

Serving Size: 93 trees

Estimated i-Tree benefits this year: \$2,293.34

**Annual values:**

**Carbon Dioxide Uptake \$150.29**

Carbon Sequestered<sup>1</sup> 1,364.79 kg

CO<sub>2</sub> Equivalent<sup>2</sup> 5,004.24 kg

**Storm Water Mitigation \$1,640.82**

Runoff Avoided 504,387.92 L

Rainfall Intercepted 684,979.42 L

**Air Pollution Removal \$502.23**

Carbon Monoxide 18.47 g

Ozone 23,595.13 g

Nitrogen Dioxide 6,223.82 g

Sulfur Dioxide 1,033.21 g

PM<sub>2.5</sub> 1,120.52 g

**Values are totals to date:**

**Carbon Dioxide Uptake<sup>4</sup> \$7,230.95**

Carbon Storage<sup>4</sup> 65,666.4 kg

CO<sub>2</sub> Equivalent<sup>2, 4</sup> 240,776.81 kg

Benefit estimates are based on USDA Forest Service research and are meant for guidance only. Visit [www.itreetools.org](http://www.itreetools.org) to learn more.



### City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013

The new City-wide Zoning By-law 569-2013 was enacted on May 9, 2013. It has been appealed under section 34(19) of the Planning Act. Even though it is under appeal, the City's Chief Building Official and the Committee of Adjustment will apply the new By-law to applications filed after its enactment. Please consult with your advisors to determine whether the new by-law has any impact.

Amendments to By-law 569-2013 have been incorporated into this [office consolidation](#). The original by-law and its amendments are with the City Clerk's office.

3291 Kingston Road

#### Legend

#### Search Results

8 result(s) for '3291 Kingston Road'.

- 3291 Kingston Rd  
M1M, Scarborough, Ward: Scarborough Southwest (20)
- 3100 Kingston Rd  
No addresses. Total length: .34kms, 5 segment(s).
- 3430 Kingston Rd  
No addresses. Total length: .2kms, 3 segment(s).
- 3752 Kingston Rd  
No addresses. Total length: .18kms, 1 segment(s).
- 4315 Kingston Rd  
No addresses. Total length: .56kms, 5 segment(s).
- 4662 Kingston Rd  
No addresses. Total length: .82kms, 9 segment(s).
- Kingston Road Pumping Station  
3231 Kingston Rd Ward: Scarborough Southwest (20), Scarborough
- Kingston Road United Church

#### Zoning Map

