



May 8, 2024

City Clerk, Attention Nancy Martins, Administrator  
Planning and Housing Committee  
Toronto City Hall  
100 Queen Street West, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5H 2N2  
[phc@toronto.ca](mailto:phc@toronto.ca)

Cc: [Councillor\\_Kandavel@toronto.ca](mailto:Councillor_Kandavel@toronto.ca), [councillor\\_ainslie@toronto.ca](mailto:councillor_ainslie@toronto.ca), [info@csvsw.ca](mailto:info@csvsw.ca),  
[mayor\\_chow@toronto.ca](mailto:mayor_chow@toronto.ca)

**Re: Opposition to the City's proposal to allow mid-rise residential developments on Major Streets**

Dear Policy and Housing Committee Chair and Members:

The point of opening up the possibility of multiplexes on major streets is to build neighbourhoods, not overwhelm them.

The right decision by Councillors today on the EHON Major Streets proposal is to defer the decision until independent studies have been completed to identify the impacts of small apartments on the identified "major streets" (Map 3) and revisit the proposal to **keep neighbourhoods liveable** for all, including mitigating privacy, noise and overlook issues [these same concerns apply to the proposed new Mid-Rise Guidelines].

In the new policy environment where the rights of residents to be notified, involved in the review of development applications, and to have an ability to appeal decisions removed, it is that much more imperative for the EHON Major Streets proposal to get things right.

The proposal before you is not that. It is a one size fits all proposal where side yard setbacks are not consistent with the adjacent properties and proposed heights are significantly greater than existing bylaws permissions. Furthermore, applicants can go to the Committee of Adjustment to make a case for further "minor variances" to increase heights and reduce setbacks, which will not result in minimizing impacts to other built forms.

The setbacks in this proposal must be increased to allow for landscaping and grading to facilitate on site stormwater management where the risks of basement flooding to adjacent properties are minimized, where damage to boundary trees is less likely, and where privacy and access to sunlight and skyview is not irrevocably lost.

At the same time, consideration must be given to increasing the minimum requirement for soft/green space (e.g., from 30% to 50%) in order to accommodate more trees and their growth to maturity, as well as the provision of a public usable space for new residents.

Lastly, many of the minor arterials identified in Map 3 as Major Streets are (when you actually come and visit them) significantly different in character. Further review of the selected streets is recommended, with input from local Councillors and residents.

In conclusion:

1. Small apartments do not belong in neighbourhoods
2. If City Council is adamant about having them there, the City has the responsibility and power to ensure proper set backs and requirements.
3. For buildings over 4 storeys there need to be much greater setbacks and studies conducted to address the impacts of, and establish solutions/requirements
  - related to stormwater runoff (impact on basement flooding),
  - related to protection of boundary trees and access to sunlight,
  - related to privacy,
  - related to location of garbage bins and utility vehicle routes,
  - related to location of driveways where underground or above ground parking is planned,
  - related to on-street parking impacts due to insufficient (i.e. no) parking spaces,
  - related to the need to increase usable greenspace (which will come with greater setbacks), and
  - related to the aggregate impact on the provision of City services to neighbourhood residents, particularly in neighbourhood improvement areas.

Or defer the decision altogether to permit more time for study.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Di Tullio,

On Behalf of

**Cliffcrest Scarborough Village SW Residents Association**