

To: The Planning and Housing Committee (by email)

To the City Clerk:

Please add these comments to the agenda for the July 15, 2025 Planning and Housing Committee meeting on item P23.3, Zoning Amendment Application for 66-66Y Third Street.

We request that these comments be publicly visible on line and understand that these comments and the personal information in this email will form part of the public record and that our name will be listed as a correspondent on agendas and minutes of City Council or its committees. Also, we understand that agendas and minutes are posted online and our name may be indexed by search engines like Google.

Subject: Reject the Zoning By-law Amendment for 66–66Y Third Street

Dear Members of the Planning and Housing Committee,

We are writing as longtime residents of New Toronto who care deeply about our neighbourhood and the people who live here. While we fully recognize and support the urgent need for supportive housing in our city, we believe the current proposal to rezone 66–66Y Third Street for a multi-storey shelter is deeply flawed.

We are not rejecting the need. We are urging the City to pursue a better, more appropriate way of meeting that need; one that respects planning principles, community input, and the long-term wellbeing of both future shelter residents and the surrounding neighbourhood.

The proposed development would exceed the current height restrictions by more than double, rising to 25 metres in a low-rise residential area where most buildings are one or two storeys. This scale and density are simply incompatible with the character of the area and will have significant impacts on the homes and people around it. For example, seniors at Woods Manor next door would face tall walls, mechanical noise, and a rooftop gathering space just metres from their balconies. These are vulnerable seniors whose day-to-day lives will be directly affected.

The proposed setbacks are equally concerning. With as little as 0 to 1 metre of buffer from neighbouring properties, privacy, access, and livability are being sacrificed. One neighbouring homeowner stands to lose functional use of their driveway and loss of enjoyment of their property due to the proximity of a new 2-storey side wall. This kind of impact on a single-family property is a significant encroachment.

Adding to this, the proposal includes no parking for staff, visitors, or service vehicles. For a 24/7 facility, this oversight is not only unrealistic, it's unsafe. Emergency vehicles, deliveries, staff shifts, and waste removal will all need reliable access, and without designated space, we fear surrounding residential streets will bear the brunt of increased traffic and disruption.

But perhaps most importantly, we question whether this site is truly suitable for the people it's meant to serve. Many shelter residents will be senior individuals with complex needs—people who deserve safe, calm, and accessible environments. This proposal offers no green space, minimal outdoor amenity, and a crowded institutional model wedged into a tight residential block. That doesn't reflect the kind of care or dignity we believe vulnerable people deserve.

The proposed harm reduction model also raises serious concerns with the absence of appropriate infrastructure and oversight. Without designated outdoor space or proper supports, people living with addiction will be forced to use in nearby laneways, school zones, and public parks. That's not responsible care. It's a setup for safety issues, for shelter residents, for our children, and for the wider community.

We also feel compelled to speak to the way this project has been managed. The City's public consultation process, in our experience, has felt limited and deeply frustrating. Many in the community feel they've not been heard. Key questions remain unanswered, and official responses have often felt dismissive or evasive. As residents trying to engage in good faith, it's disheartening to feel like we're being talked *at* instead of worked *with*.

Unfortunately, the City's handling of this proposal gives the impression that the outcome has already been predetermined. Rather than listening to the community and adjusting course where necessary, the process feels like a rubber stamp exercise—another item to check off on Mayor Chow's to-do list, rather than a genuine effort to find the right solution for everyone involved.

Our concerns are rooted in a desire for thoughtful, equitable planning. We are not saying "not in our backyard"—we are saying "**not like this.**" We want to help vulnerable people. We just want to ensure it's done responsibly, in a location that truly meets their needs and respects those already living here.

It's a fact, not a complaint, that our neighbourhood already does more than its fair share. New Toronto represents 64% of all Rent-Geared-to-Income housing in all of South Etobicoke and has a subsidized rental rate more than double the ward average. We've welcomed a wide range of housing and social services here over the years, including the newest being built now to support vulnerable hearing and sight impaired. But when more and more services are added without proportional private investment, proper planning, or transparency, it begins to feel like our neighbourhood is being unfairly targeted and overlooked.

This shelter proposal also contradicts the City's own planning frameworks. The Lake Shore Boulevard West Avenues Study, which was meant to guide sustainable growth and private investment here, appears to have been shelved without explanation. Why? Perhaps there is a growing recognition that no developer or private investor will commit to revitalizing an area that continues to be treated as a social dumping ground, rather than a place worthy of long term investment?

Lastly, and most importantly the site simply does not meet the City's own shelter siting standards. At just 9,246 square feet, it falls well below the 15,000-square-foot minimum guideline. It is also the smallest site of any current shelter proposal and the only one located on a narrow, low-density residential street, NOT on an Avenue or Major Street.

To move forward at this site, in spite of so many red flags, challenges the City's credibility and contradicts the very standards meant to guide equitable, sustainable planning.

We respectfully ask the Planning and Housing Committee to reject this zoning by-law amendment and urge City Council to pause any further action on this site. We ask you to advise City council to instruct staff to identify an alternative location that truly meets the City's own shelter and zoning criteria. 66 Third Street simply doesn't fit the bill.

We want to be part of the solution and ask for a fair, transparent and community driven planning process. We want to see vulnerable people housed in spaces that are calm, safe, and dignified. But we also want to ensure that development is done with care for the future residents and for the community that surrounds them. Ward 3 is large, and there are unquestionably more appropriate, better equipped locations for a homeless shelter. We are not refusing to help. We are pleading that it be done right.

Our community deserves better.

Thank you,

Karen Adams and Steve Baumgartner
Residents New Toronto M8V 3E2