

Toronto City Hall
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

February 3, 2026
File 9009

Attn: John D. Elvidge, City Clerk's Office

RE: February 4, 2026 Council Meeting
Written Submission Regarding the Scarborough Centre Secondary Plan – Item PH27.3
1215 – 1255 McCowan Road, Scarborough
City of Toronto

Weston Consulting is the planning consultant for the owner of McCowan Square, municipally known as 1215-1255 McCowan Road, Scarborough, in the City of Toronto (the 'subject property'), and is pleased to provide this written submission with respect to the subject property.

The subject property consists of 18,375 sq.m at the northeast corner of McCowan Road and Ellesmere Road. The subject property is currently occupied by several large retail uses and surface parking. The property is located approximately 175 metres to the south of the planned transit station for Scarborough Centre.

Applications for an Official Plan Amendment & Zoning By-law Amendment were submitted to the City in March 2022 to facilitate the development of the subject property with three mixed-use high-rise towers consisting of 25, 45 & 55 storeys in height, GFA of 117,913 sq.m and a proposed density of 6.42 FSI. The development proposal is to include 1,412 rental and condominium units and contemplates 4,810 sq.m of commercial space at grade.

We have been monitoring the Scarborough Centre Study ('the Study') since Phase 1 work began in the fall of 2018. In particular, we attended the Community Consultation Meeting on December 9, 2021 (Phase 3) and May 10, 2022 (Phase 4). We prepared a formal submission letter dated September 27, 2022 with our comments during the Phase 4 Community Consultation.

We have reviewed the Scarborough Centre Secondary Plan, Draft OPA 871 and the Staff Report and Attachment dated January 8, 2026. We further monitored the Statutory Public Meeting on January 22, 2026 and the amendments made at the Planning and Housing Committee Meeting.

We wish to provide our support for a new Secondary Plan which will replace the outdated 2005 Secondary Plan and provide a vision for distinct districts, a vibrant and complete and connected, sustainable and resilient community. However, we have some concerns with the current draft including:

- Many of the policies are too prescriptive and are more appropriate to be included in the Zoning By-law Amendment. Secondary Plans should consist of policies that provide a land use planning framework and high-level vision. Policies related to land use designations, compatibility and transition are appropriate, however, prescriptive, mandatory and numerical matters are not appropriate and do not allow flexibility for policies and result in unnecessary amendments. In particular, Map 5-10 – Building Setbacks and Policy 7.2.1 are too prescriptive for an Official Plan as they contain prescriptive numerical standards.

- Map 5-6 (as well as others) identify a ‘Planned Street’ on the subject property which is in a different alignment than earlier versions of the Draft Secondary Plan and the in-force Transportation Master Plan OPA 408 and 409. Proposed Policy 8.2.1 details the street network which *‘will provide a fine grain of streets and improve connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicle and enhance access within the Plan Area’*. Proposed Policy 8.2.3 further states that *“The exact location, alignment, access, and design of each new street, as illustrated on Map5-6 Street Network, will be defined, conveyed, and delivered through the development approval process, identified capital expenditures or other implementation mechanisms identified in this Plan.”* While, we support the principles of creating new local connections through the subject property, we maintain that more flexibility on the type of connection needs to be considered and options for both public and private streets through the subject property and Secondary Plan Area, especially if Staff propose to deviate from the approved street alignment currently in force. We further request that the word ‘conveyance’ be removed from reference in Proposed Policy 8.2.
- Furthermore, Map 5-7 identifies a 20 m Right-of-Way Width for two new streets on the subject property. Notwithstanding the appropriateness of two new public streets, a 20 m Right-of-Way is typically associated with a Major Street in the City of Toronto not a local road connection between McCowan Rd. and Ellesmere Road.
- Map 5-9 identifies a “Planned Park” at the northeast corner on the subject property. Proposed Policy 6.5.1a) indicates that *“Planned Parks: parks approved through the development review process or recommended public lands that are planned to become parks overtime”*. We note, that the location of the park on the subject property is neither approved through the development review process, nor public lands. While parkland for the subject property will be provided in accordance with the Planning Act, the location and on-site dedication has not been confirmed nor approved. We maintain that the northeast corner could be a possible location for on-site parkland, however flexibility in the Map and policy needs to be considered.
- Proposed Policy 7.9.1 states that mid-rise buildings and low-rise buildings are recommended adjacent to Parks and Natural Areas to mitigate scale and limit shadow and wind impact, promoting pedestrian comfort within Parks and Natural Areas, and that the tower components of tall building are to be setback from Parks and Natural Areas. We recommend removing the reference to ‘low-rise buildings’ as this does not meet the intent of achieving intensification adjacent to transit stations. Furthermore, we recommend including ‘as appropriate’ as there are instances where tall buildings are also appropriate adjacent to Parks and Natural Areas (as detailed below).
- Map 5-11 and proposed Policy 7.5.1 provide that building height ranges will guide the built form. It is our opinion that policies should indicate that these are ‘general’ height ranges and allow for some slight flexibility (i.e. 44 versus 45 storeys throughout the height ranges). Map 5-11 appears to not include a height range on the northeast portion of the subject property. We understand that this omission has to do with the intent to place a park at the northeast corner, however, if a park is located elsewhere on the property, there still needs to be underlying land use designation (and height range) for development of the property.
- Policy 7.7 address ‘Mid-rise Buildings’. Proposed Policy 7.7.2 indicate that *‘Mid-rise building locations are to be provided on large sites that can accommodate more than one development block with new*

streets.' It is our opinion that this policy needs to be more general as there are locations which meet the criteria of Policy 7.7.2 but also where mid-rise buildings are not appropriate; for example, adjacent to a transit station.

To summarize, we support some of the overall land use policy direction in the Draft Secondary Plan. However, we recommend revisions to maps and proposed policies as outlined above to reflect the current development proposal for the subject property that is under review by the City and, more generally, to provide additional flexible policy direction at the Secondary Plan level.

Thank you for consideration of these comments. We note, that there are additional comments of concern to our client with respect to the proposed draft Secondary Plan, as it pertains to the active development proposal. We request to be notified of any further updates to the draft Secondary Plan process.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jane McFarlane at extension 225.

Yours Truly,

Weston Consulting

Per:



Jane McFarlane, BAH, MES(PL.), MCIP, RPP
Partner, Planning Lead

CC: David Bronskill, Goodmans LLP