

From: [Natasha Mistry](#)
To: [Executive Committee](#)
Subject: [External Sender] Written submission to 2025EX24.4 - Leveraging City-Owned Real Estate to Support City Council Objectives - Long-Term Financial Plan Update
Date: June 16, 2025 11:57:16 AM

Good day,

Please make this statement visible to the general public on Item 2025EX24.4 - Leveraging City-Owned Real Estate to Support City Council Objectives - Long-Term Financial Plan Update

I am writing as a concerned resident in New Toronto, where City-owned Green P parking lots are being targeted for redevelopment under the direction of EX24.4—specifically, the lot at 66 Third Street (a quiet dead-end street), which is being removed for construction of a homeless shelter.

While we understand and support the need for more affordable housing and a long-term financial plan, this approach puts the survival of our small retail and commercial district at serious risk of failure. It puts vulnerable residents, like our children and seniors at risk of exposure to crime, public drug use, anti-social behaviour and mental health struggles. The City is prioritizing sites deemed “under-utilized,” but a resident-funded Freedom of Information showed that the 66 Third St. lot is operating at 80% occupancy. It is not underused—it is just underpriced compared to other lots across the city.

Removing this lot—along with two others already flagged on Fifth and Sixth Streets—would eliminate 62% of our public parking in a car-dependent area classified as a Transit Desert. It would devastate small businesses along Lake Shore Boulevard West, which rely on car traffic due to low pedestrian volume. We are a car-dependent neighbourhood, not by preference, but because public transit here is unreliable and does not connect us well to other parts of the city.

These Green P lots are essential infrastructure, not surplus. Their removal disrupts both access and the delicate balance of our fragile commercial strip when it can be completely avoided.

Rather than targeting vulnerable, low-traffic neighbourhoods, we urge Council to prioritize larger surface lots in high-density, transit-rich areas—and consider building housing above covered parking, not instead of it.

By constructing a homeless shelter on a lot too small for that purpose, abutting modest bungalows and single family homes, on a quiet residential street, you are risking the collapse of a neighbourhood. By removing councillors and delegating city staff for the site selection of homeless shelters, Council has opened the door for chaos, inequity and discriminatory practices. The decision is now made by a desk top search, without any regard for the neighbourhood affected. It also means the local BIA is unable to advocate for themselves on decisions that have already been made by City Council. Ultimately, nobody directly impacted by the shelter or loss of parking

is allowed to comment or contest it. The decision is made at City Hall, without any impact study, democracy or recourse! The people most affected have been muzzled.

I urge this Committee and CreateTO to pause and reconsider the approach being taken. Consult with BIAs, with local businesses, and with neighbourhoods like ours before removing infrastructure we simply can't afford to lose, and bringing us an institution we cannot absorb or support.

Let's build smarter, not just faster. Because without proper planning, we're not solving problems—we're just shifting them.

Please take an opportunity to reexamine and focus on the institutional nature of a homeless shelter (of any size) with 24/7 wrap around supports, services and full time staffing. Recognize the need to place shelters where the nature of their operation will not be irreversibly detrimental to the community in which you are placing it.

Thank you for your serious consideration on this delicate matter.

With thanks,
Natasha Mistry
M8V