

## **councilmeeting**

---

**From:** Claire Malcolmson <claire.malcolmson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** May 21, 2026 8:39 AM  
**To:** Clerk  
**Subject:** [External Sender] Fwd: comments re 2026.SC31.19

Hello Clerks,  
Would you please make my letter public? I understand you black out contact information.  
thank you,  
Claire

Claire Malcolmson

Environmental Consultant

c) 647-267-7572

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Claire Malcolmson** <[claire.malcolmson@gmail.com](mailto:claire.malcolmson@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Wed, May 20, 2026 at 11:20 AM  
**Subject:** comments re 2026.SC31.19  
**To:** <[clerk@toronto.ca](mailto:clerk@toronto.ca)>

Dear Toronto Council members,

I work with Mid-rise builders, planners, architects and city-builders who are working together to advocate for reforms for Mid-rise. We do not support this motion to review the removal of minimum parking requirements as it applies to Scarborough. Nor do we support a prohibition on new condominium, townhome, and multiplex developments from petitioning for on-street residential parking permits, in Scarborough.

Toronto Council must decide if it is in fact supporting the creation of badly needed housing, or not. Supporting this motion will slow new housing development in Scarborough, or make it more expensive, or both.

Toronto has housing targets it is not yet meeting, despite best efforts to use public land, stimulate development of rental properties and affordable housing, zoning for Mid-rise and simplifying Mid-rise Design Guidelines. These have all been helpful measures that reduce the cost of building. This matters because we need builders to build housing, and it will not happen if projects are not viable. To date, Council and Planning has responded to the realities of building in 2026, by shifting focus to improving feasibility for builders. The elimination of parking minimums was helpful to this end because adding a basement for parking has a massive price tag.

Let us be clear: builders are able to provide parking if they believe it will sell their project. The fact that they are not tells you that their projects are less viable with parking.

Personally, I live in Scarborough, and I can tell you that not every resident shares the view that ultra wide streets free of parked cars is an essential human right. There is abundant on-street parking practically everywhere, and most single family homes have driveways, many of which are really large. I feel strongly that people who already own homes, and that includes me, should not, for moral and ethical reasons, block other people from being housed, in an apartment, multiplex, Mid-rise or tower.

Low density parts of the City are still parts of the City, and enjoy the benefits and services of the higher tax revenue from higher density areas of the City. There is no valid reason for Scarborough to ask to be treated differently than other parts of the City unless it also wants to receive less services.

Indeed, if there were more people living in higher densities throughout Scarborough, transit would be more viable, and therefore the problem this motion claims to address would diminish.

If any action emerges from this motion, it should be to fast track Mid-rise on Major streets and Avenues where transit exists, to help bring up the population to support transit, while housing people where access to transit is a viable alternative to driving.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely, Claire Malcolmson  
Manager, Mid-rise Advocacy Group

Claire Malcolmson

Environmental Consultant

c) 647-267-7572