

To: Chair and Members of the Planning and Housing Committee
Re: PH23.3 – Zoning By-law Amendment for 66-66Y Third Street

Dear Committee Members,

I write today as a local resident and parent to voice my strong opposition to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for 66-66Y Third Street. While I support the City's efforts to expand shelter infrastructure, this location—on a quiet, narrow, low-density residential street—raises substantial concerns regarding land use compatibility, safety, and adherence to planning principles.

Land Use Compatibility and Built Form Conflicts

The proposed shelter introduces a high-intensity, institutional use into a neighbourhood zoned for low-density residential living. This site sits directly adjacent to single-family homes and a seniors' residence, both of which are considered sensitive land uses. The 20-metre height and lack of appropriate setbacks fail to provide a transition between this facility and existing dwellings, contravening the intent of Zoning By-law 569-2013 and disregarding the Official Plan's emphasis on compatible development. A nine-metre separation from Woods Manor is not adequate buffering—particularly with rooftop amenity space and the absence of clear screening measures.

Traffic, Parking, and Access Strain

This street is not designed to accommodate 24/7 operations. Emergency shelters of this scale bring increased foot traffic, service vehicles, EMS calls, and daily staff movement. Yet no on-site parking is provided. The removal of the current lot—already operating at 80% utilization—means staff, visitors, and displaced parkers will crowd nearby streets. This creates a real risk to pedestrian safety, delays emergency access, and strains an already-congested streetscape.

Safety and Vulnerability of Adjacent Residents

Good planning considers context and the needs of existing residents. Seniors and young families make up the majority of this neighbourhood. Yet no meaningful transition zone—no park, laneway, or commercial buffer—exists to moderate the impact of this development. This is not just a design oversight—it's a failure to protect the safety and comfort of vulnerable populations.

Precedent and Procedural Concerns

If approved, this amendment would set a concerning precedent: that institutional uses may override residential zoning without sufficient public consultation or transition planning. That a structure of this scale and use could be introduced with fewer restrictions than a private homeowner seeking a simple renovation calls into question the equity and transparency of the process. The community deserves a fair voice in shaping its future.

Respectfully, I urge the Committee to reject this zoning amendment or, at minimum, require the City to revisit the location and scale of this proposal. Planning must balance broader goals with local realities. This neighbourhood is not opposed to helping—what we oppose is being overlooked.

Sincerely,

Wendy Salisko
New Toronto Parent