

October 17, 2025

To: Etobicoke York Community Council
RE: 2025.EY26.7 - 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West



Dear Members of the Committee,

The Richmond Gardens Residents and Ratepayers Association (RGRRA) represents the Richmond Gardens and Princess Anne community, including residents immediately surrounding 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West. We have a long track record of engaging constructively with City staff, Councillors, and developers to ensure that redevelopment projects balance growth with livability.

On July 14, 2021 City Council-approved a Zoning By-law amendment application (By-law 834-2021) for Richview Square to permit **a comprehensive and thoughtful redevelopment plan for the entire site**. This included three residential buildings of 11, 11 and 12 storeys while maintaining a significant portion of the existing Richview Square retail plaza, that balanced needed intensification with neighbourhood compatibility.

The RGRRA actively participated in the planning process with all parties to ensure that an appropriate development, that represented good planning and was generally compatible with the immediately abutting low density residential neighborhoods was achieved. We believed that after many years of working with Trinity (the developer) that this mid-rise development would proceed as approved by Council at the City of Toronto in 2021. Regrettably this has not been the case.

Chief Rationale for supporting 2021 approved plans

1. This is a massive 750,000 square foot, largely residential intensification, at **net densities that are more than 4 times** the net intensity of any historic or new apartment building east of Kipling Avenue.
2. This bylaw delivers +600 units with net density in the range of 4.0-4.4 and mid-range heights at the **upper limit of City of Toronto Mid Rise Design Guidelines**, which are still the legal applicable guidelines.
3. The height and densities permitted **fully recognized the impending Eglinton LRT**.

CreateTO Involvement

The final CreateTO agreement included several Development Conditions that are not/have not been met:

- A mixed-use proposal (residential and retail/service) which supports transit-oriented development while being sensitive to the existing character and context of the area and specific market conditions;
- A commitment to develop in collaboration with Build Toronto a Community Engagement Strategy & Plan that will respond to community and stakeholders concerns throughout the development process; and

- No OLT Appeal: “The Purchaser agrees to use commercially reasonable efforts to work with the City to achieve all necessary approvals consistent with the Plans as submitted to Build Toronto. The Purchaser further agrees that it will not bring any appeals from City Council or Committee of Adjustment decisions (or non-decisions) to the Ontario Land Tribunal (or any predecessor or successor entity) regarding the Development (other than in response to third party appeals) without the prior consent of Build Toronto, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.”

Less than 18 months later in January of 2023, the developer applied to rezone the site. This initiative employed “Tall Buildings” at 31 and 22 storeys (versus the two at 11 storeys) at a scale usually reserved for strategically buffered and Secondary Planned City Centres served by full capacity rapid transit with multi modal interregional connections. It is noted that at no time did the proponent enter into any discussions with the community regarding this initiative despite an intimate awareness of the involvement of the community over the past 5 years.

Additionally, we’re concerned about the process surrounding the sale of the CreateTO lands to Trinity. We understand these public lands were sold based on the Council-approved density, which could not be appealed to the OLT. The current proposal nearly doubles that density, allowing the developer to profit by reselling portions of the site once it’s severed into four lots. It is also troubling that these lands were not made available through a public offering process but transferred through a sole-source arrangement. This further erodes public confidence and trust of the City and CreateTO.

**Multiple Committee of Adjustment applications
with over a dozen variances undermine a coordinated planning approach**

As outlined in the Executive Director, Development Review’s Status Update, the developer has submitted six applications to the Committee of Adjustment with often multiple variances within each, to transform the development. The developer’s piecemeal approach has dismantled the original wholistic development and now puts the much-needed retail at serious risk.

Of note, Committee of Adjustment upheld that a number of these variances were not Minor or within the general intent of By-law 834-2021, and neither were they an appropriate development of the site or the land use context or consistent with the general intent of the City’s Official Plan that requires Mixed Use projects to “reinforce” the adjoining Neighbourhood pattern of development.

Through these variances and rezoning applications, the developer appears to apply a “divide and conquer” approach to redesigning the development to their full advantage with no community consultation whatsoever (minus the one meeting the Committee of Adjustment asked them to hold). They have undertaken to:

- Keep a private road that was meant to support the original development, although the new proposal creates a minor arterial road of +9k vehicles/per day, and may be the only private road in the City to do so AND be built over three or four separate underground garages (subject to the timing and preference of future owners of the severed lots).
- Drive heights that are not consistent with historical or new apartments in the abutting area. The heights they seek match and exceed the heights granted to buildings abutting apartments or Church parking lots, not single-family homes.

- Eliminate the grocery store in Building C and convert one commercial floor to two residential floors.
- Achieve 14 residential storeys in Building C (vs 11) per above and with the approved conversion of the mechanical penthouse to residential.
- Cut Building C residential parking supply from 316 to 159 spaces (for 370 units), and cut the visitor parking supply from 55 to 20 spaces. Legally, we submit that this project was approved by Toronto City Council in July 2021 under By-laws 835-2021 and 836-2021. As such, it remains subject to the parking regulations in effect at that time and is governed by Zoning By-law 569-2013. Practically, this level is grossly insufficient for a 370-unit building and is far below both the original approval and the norms of all surrounding established developments which require 1.16 parking spaces per unit, and recently approved developments requiring .90 spaces per unit, versus the developer's ask of 0.43.
- Cut visitor parking in Building C from 55 to 20 spaces, arguing spillover can flow into the plaza parking spaces which is not a viable solution per below point.
- Cut plaza parking from the current +270 spaces, and the 245 approved in 2021, to 56 surface parking spots in the final execution of the development. This is grossly insufficient for even the +100 cars that can be found there weekdays during non-peak times to access a largely derelict shopping plaza. Trinity claims there are 263 commercial parking spaces across Phases 1 and 2 but these will be eliminated once Buildings A and B are built.

Significant departure from Council approved plans

The cumulative effect of these variances departs significantly from the Council-approved development with negative impacts to current and future residents. Key concerns include:

- Lack of comprehensive and coordinated planning approvals as opposed to piecemeal approvals through variance applications, severance applications and a new 2023 ZBA application for the site.
- Resident parking shortages: Existing residents will not be eligible for street parking, and no public parking lots exist in the immediate vicinity.
- Traffic and safety conflicts: Increased pressure on local streets will heighten conflicts among vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists.
- Loss of neighbourhood retail viability: The proposal undermines the stability of local retail for the RGRRA neighbours and the complete community stature envisioned for this area.
- Fragmented redevelopment: The variances represent a piecemeal approach that is inconsistent with Council's comprehensive 2021 approval.
- A variance to allow 211 additional units without parking cannot reasonably be considered "minor" or generally consistent with the intent of By-law 834-2021.

The community supported the 2021 development because it was Mid Rise, comprehensive, coordinated, and respected both planning objectives and neighbourhood realities. This application represents a substantial departure from that framework and undermines public trust.

The developer has employed a process that breeds distrust and disrespects Council's intent and the collaborative efforts of residents to create a wholisitic development.

- How is Create TO's intent behind "no OLT appeal" being ignored or bypassed?

- Given intent to resell and profit from CreateTO lands, what assurance is there of proceeding with anything Council approves and avoid reviewing and editing these four buildings without building the units for years?
- With the loss of a grocery store, what assurance do we have to maintain the current services and retail and the parking it requires, along a public road and up to four separate lot owners who may build at different times or not at all?
- What could make the grocery store work? What was proposed that made it unpalatable? How can we assure this benefit in exchange for so much the developer has already obtained and wishes to obtain from Council and OLT?

In conclusion, we appreciate the opportunity to bring to light the shocking sideways approach the developer has brought to a Council-approved plan that was intended to be “final” under the Development Conditions set out by CreateTO.

Respectfully submitted,

Luisa Girotto and Sonia Pace
Co-Chairs, Richmond Gardens Residents Association

View of site location and earlier version of proposed mid-rise buildings



