

## **councilmeeting**

---

**From:** Dorothy Kochanski <dkochanski@rogers.com>  
**Sent:** May 20, 2026 10:37 PM  
**To:** councilmeeting  
**Subject:** [External Sender] My comments for 2026.TE32.9 on May 20, 2026 City Council

**Categories:** Communication (New)

To the City Clerk:

Please add my comments to the agenda for the May 20, 2026 City Council meeting on item 2026.TE32.9, 390, 394, 396 and 398 Spadina Road - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - Decision Report - Approval

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

Comments:

Re: TE32.9 – 390, 394, 396 and 398 Spadina Road – Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Decision Report – Approval

Dear Members of City Council,

On behalf of the Board of Directors and residents of The Montclair Co-Ownership Inc. at 60 Montclair Avenue, I would like to thank Councillor Matlow's office, City Planning, and Legal staff for their continued work and engagement regarding the proposed development at 390–398 Spadina Road.

We appreciate the effort and responsiveness shown throughout this process and acknowledge the ongoing discussions intended to address community concerns. However, after reviewing the direction of the proposed motion and discussions to date, we remain very concerned that several of the key protections specifically requested on behalf of 60 Montclair do not appear to be reflected or confirmed.

To be clear, the draft motion and Zoning By-law Amendment modifications previously circulated by legal counsel for the South Forest Hill Residents Association reflected the framework, protections, and commitments that 60 Montclair reasonably expected would form the basis of the final motion advanced to Council.

Collaboratively, we would therefore expect the final wording to continue to meaningfully address and secure, among other things:

- the increased rear setback along the laneway interface;
- the requested balcony limitations and projections consistent with the renderings originally presented to the community;

- stronger and more explicit protections relating to the Nick Vitantonio laneway and associated parking/loading operations;
- protections relating to garbage pickup, service vehicles, deliveries, accessibility access, and construction staging impacts; and
- the broader built-form and public realm items identified through the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment modifications.

From our perspective, these are foundational components of the community discussions and not ancillary items that can simply be deferred or softened without materially affecting the protections being sought for neighbouring residents.

In particular, we remain concerned that the current language relating to the laneway and loading/access operations is too general and leaves significant room for interpretation later. Residents at 60 Montclair rely heavily on the laneway for accessibility, deliveries, service access, and day-to-day operations. We believe the motion should more clearly and specifically reference maintaining unobstructed access for residents, accessibility needs, deliveries, garbage and service vehicles, and construction-related impacts throughout all phases of the project.

Similarly, we have not yet seen confirmation that the requested setback and balcony provisions remain under consideration. These are important built-form protections that directly affect privacy, overlook, visual massing, and the interface between the proposed development and neighbouring properties.

Our concern is that if the zoning is approved without these items being secured at the zoning and/or motion stage, there will be materially less certainty that they will ultimately be addressed later through site plan discussions alone.

We want to continue working collaboratively and constructively on this matter, but candidly, as currently framed, we do not believe the proposed direction adequately addresses the concerns raised by 60 Montclair or reflects the expectations arising from the community discussions and commitments made during that process.

We are very open to continuing discussions and finding workable language; however, we are not comfortable with these matters being deferred into broader future discussions without clearer protections being identified now.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns and for your continued attention to the impacts this development will have on neighbouring residents and properties.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Kochanski  
President, Board of Directors  
The Montclair Co-Ownership Inc.  
60 Montclair Avenue