

May 30, 2025

City Clerk, Attention: Nancy Martins, Administrator,
Etobicoke York Community Council City Hall, 100 Queen
Street West, 2nd Floor Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

Email: etcc@toronto.ca

RE: Request to Amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Application Number 22
236554 WET 03 OZ Location 3807-3815 and 3819-3829 Lake Shore Boulevard
West

As a resident dwelling at 3845 Lake Shore Blvd West, I am writing with respect to serious personal concerns regarding the proposal for the above-mentioned location. Specific concerns include:

- 1) Our City currently is desperate for new, and affordable, housing, but this large-scale building proposal, in conjunction with several other major proposed residential construction projects our neighbourhood, is not the solution. It raises too many concerns about the significant lack of infrastructure (e.g., water, sewage, hydro, schools, hospitals, police and fire accessibility) currently available in the area to support the influx of large numbers of people, in addition to increased traffic, at a location that currently fails to meet the demands of peak traffic on a daily basis.

Available services are already greatly stretched and struggling to meet the needs of the people living in the community. The proposed building far exceeds the allowable number of levels/units currently permissible in the area. The issue of concern regarding density and insufficient infrastructure in the area is a damning one.

- 2) Pursuant to the previous point, a by-law was recently passed by the City restricting the height of buildings just east of the proposed construction site along Lake Shore Blvd West. Why was the area of the proposed building site excluded from this restriction? This is unfair to residents living in proximity to the proposed building site, and likely to impact property values negatively. The proposed building is not congruent with the rest of the neighborhood, according to the planning principles in existence. The next tallest building in the area is only 16 floors, about 49 metres. The proposed building is 39 floors, about 129 metres, or 2.63 times as high, and would be taller than any other building within three kilometres.

Despite the proposed project being in the PMTSA, where the only extra allowance seems to be building height above what the city proposes for avenue (11 - 12 floors), the project should still comply with other design requirements, such as depth of lot to height of building, building height to road width ratio of 1:1, and having a transition zone between the building and the surrounding neighbourhood/buildings. None of these requirements seem to be taken into consideration with this project.

- 3) The construction of such an inappropriately scaled building will have a huge environmental impact on the neighborhood for a prolonged period with respect to noise pollution, dust, debris, and traffic. As there are many families with children residing near the building site, and a school, this is a factor that will potentially have a significant impact on their health and quality of life for a very prolonged period of time.
- 4) The proposed building as per this rejigged proposal, would have 490 dwelling units supported by only 62 parking spaces for residents and 9 visitor parking spaces - a ratio of one parking space for every 7.9 units. Despite the proximity of transportation in the area, it is an unreasonable proposal to assume that with the planned flood of residents and the few visitor parking spaces, it will be sufficient to meet the actual needs of the building. There is therefore a critical concern that there would be a significant problem with illegal, haphazard parking in the visitor parking areas of neighboring buildings, local retail business parking, and on the streets, causing undue problems, and expenses, for existing residents and businesses. There is already currently a significant problem with illegal parking of GO transit users on the streets and in our condominium and business parking areas. This problem is further exacerbated by illegal parking of users of Marie Curtis Park on weekends.

For comparison, I live in the condominium complex immediately west of the proposed development. There are 240 units in the complex, with 48 visitor parking spaces (including three accessible parking spaces). There are many times during the year when there is not enough parking for visitors, so how could 9 visitor parking spaces be sufficient for a building with over twice as many units?

- 5) The proposed building will be located right at the site of a very major intersection at the foot of Brown's Line (which is the terminal end of Hwy 427 and often a southbound exit from the Gardiner expressway), and Lake Shore Blvd West. It is typical during the construction of such buildings for one lane of traffic to be blocked accommodating building equipment and given the small depth size of the building property, it can be anticipated that such will be

the case. The impact on traffic flow in the area, especially during rush hours, will be very negative. The suggested addition of a new traffic light leading to the turnoff to go north on to Brown's Line at Thirty-Eight Street would further exacerbate the traffic flow problems, due to the short distance between the stop lights. Such would further exacerbate major back-up issues that will occur on to Brown's Line leading to the 427, and also for eastbound traffic on Lake Shore Blvd West.

In addition to causing increased stress, risk and hardship for people residing in the area due to longer commuting/transportation times, the potential traffic flow issue in the area poses significant concerns regarding pedestrian and driver safety, as well as significant safety concerns regarding the capability of emergency vehicles (police, ambulance, fire trucks) to be able to flow through the area to meet resident needs.

- 6) There is a material concern for our condominium building owners/tenants about the proximity of the proposed building site and our underground car park. Has the City seen the results of any study conducted to assess the impact of the vibration and ground disturbance that will be caused by the digging and construction of the new building, and on the underground of the adjacent buildings? Further, in light of the changing weather patterns, the impact of a significant rainfall when the hole is being excavated for the new building on the neighboring underground car park, and for site drainage in general, also needs to be considered.
- 7) As noted in the current engineering studies, winds around the site, and the building would be more than what the City currently allows; what measures has the builder taken to address this issue?
- 8) Presently, there are 20 trees on the property. These are to be removed but according to the plans, there will only be 11 new trees. More trees should be added along the west, east and north sides of the building to compensate for the trees being removed.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns regarding the proposed building. I look forward to an appropriate response from the contractor to the City in addressing these concerns.

Sincerely,

Antonio de Sousa

Marguerite Gagnon

Teresa Krzepisz

Juan Crane

Annmarie Vrscaj

Stan Krzepisz

John Ericson

Nikhil Alvares

Ihor Moshkov

Edward Hunt

Richard Pelton

Tetyana Salo

Tammy Townsend

Miodrag Zoric

Carmelita Dela Cruz

Dan Haugh	Kevin Kelly	Pratheet Sonowal Pathak
Shahbaz Lehoni	Deborah Kelly	Vihaan Sonowal Pathak
Andrew Noakowski	Ron Stern	Barry Andrewes
Wieslaw Tobola	Stanley Kaihavana	Keith McEachern
Oksana Shmyha	Vahbiz Homavazir	Lloyd Mclen
Yuza Bobak	Mary Susan McGrath	Linnyk Sergiy
Glenn Carter	Myron Moksymiow	Vernikovska Yaroslava
Svetlana Guralmika	Irene Eintula	Halina Obloza
Dianne Carmichael	Shirley Shaw	Erika Mayer
Oumawattie Singh	M. MacDonald	Vjaceslavs Guralniks
Sandra Sutherland	Maria Majda	Tori Goulart
Heino Nielsen	Danny Rutledge	Caroline Ivanco
Tania Porter	John A. Currie	Stephen Carson
Jude Ulysse	Bishov Pathal	Michelle Dagenais
Irene Minkowski	Jahnnavi Sonowal	