

From: [info](#)
To: [Councillor Perruzza](#); [councilmeeting](#); [Clerk](#)
Subject: [External Sender] Written Comments – Item EY32.5 – 3100 Weston Road
Date: June 19, 2026 12:46:50 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[PAA 3100 Weston FINAL Submission.pdf](#)
[March-16-2026-correspondence-regarding-By-law-1113-2025.pdf](#)
[PAA 3100 Weston OLT-FINAL A.pdf](#)
[Tyler-Marr-confirmation-of-utilization-of-outdated-nef-nep.pdf](#)

Mayor Chow and Members of Toronto City Council,

I am writing on behalf of the Pearson Accountability Alliance regarding Item EY32.5 – 3100 Weston Road – Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Appeal Report.

The Pearson Accountability Alliance supports the recommendation that the City Solicitor and appropriate City staff attend the Ontario Land Tribunal to oppose the application in its current form.

Our comments concern two related matters:

1. whether the proposed residential use is compatible with the actual aircraft-noise and environmental conditions affecting this location; and
2. the inconsistency between Council’s previous authorization of financial incentives associated with residential development at 3100 Weston Road and the City’s current decision to oppose the only active planning application for the same property.

Current aircraft-noise conditions

The Pearson Accountability Alliance prepared a detailed submission containing 15 months of continuous aircraft-noise data covering January 2025 through March 2026. The measurements were obtained from the Greater Toronto Airports Authority’s own Noise Monitoring Terminal at Acacia Park, in proximity to the proposed development. The evidence demonstrates:

- nighttime aircraft-noise exceedances on nearly every night examined;
- median intervals of approximately two minutes between aircraft events during active periods;
- measured peak levels reaching 95.8 dB;
- prolonged sequences of closely spaced aircraft events; and
- limited or absent opportunities for sustained nighttime quiet.

For example, more than 1,100 nighttime exceedances were recorded during January 2026, with exceedances occurring on every night of that month.

These are not theoretical or projected conditions. They are current and repeatedly measured conditions documented through the airport authority’s own monitoring infrastructure.

The attached report was prepared in relation to the Ontario Land Tribunal proceeding.

However, I was unable to attend the Tribunal's initial online hearing and, as a result, the Pearson Accountability Alliance was not granted participant status.

The report should therefore not be understood as material that has necessarily been formally accepted into the Tribunal record.

For this reason, I respectfully ask Council to ensure that the report is reviewed by the City Solicitor and appropriate planning staff and that, where procedurally appropriate, the current measured aircraft-noise evidence it contains is placed before the Tribunal as part of the City's case.

Reliance on outdated planning assumptions

City Planning confirmed in March 2026 that its review of the 3100 Weston Road proposal relies on the composite outer envelope of Toronto Pearson's approved 2000 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) and 1996 Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) contour mapping. City Planning also confirmed that the City relies on information supplied by the GTAA when reviewing land-use proposals near the airport.

That reliance should be considered in light of documented transparency concerns regarding the GTAA's public noise reporting.

The Pearson Accountability Alliance has previously identified unexplained overnight changes to published aircraft-noise complaint reports, without a clear public correction notice, version history or explanation of what had been changed and why.

The Alliance has also identified significant unresolved questions regarding the GTAA's reporting of aircraft noise compared with ambient or background noise. Independent analysis of the underlying Acacia Park monitoring data indicates that the reported ambient noise environment may be materially overstated, which would make the relative contribution of aircraft noise appear smaller.

These matters raise concerns about transparency in the GTAA's reporting methodology, data processing, version control and disclosure of underlying calculations. They also demonstrate why information supplied by the GTAA should not be accepted without access to the supporting data, a clear explanation of the methodology used and appropriate independent verification.

Accordingly, the City should not rely exclusively on GTAA assurances when assessing airport land-use compatibility at 3100 Weston Road.

The same correspondence explains that NEF contour maps are intended to forecast aircraft-noise exposure approximately five to ten years into the future, while NEP contour maps project exposure up to twenty years into the future. The forecasting horizons of both the 2000 NEF and the 1996 NEP have therefore long elapsed.

Despite this, these approximately 25- to 30-year-old contours continue to form the basis of the City's land-use review.

These legacy contours and their cumulative averaging methodology do not adequately represent:

- cumulative overnight disturbance;
- closely clustered aircraft events;
- present-day traffic density and operational patterns;
- concentrated flight routing;
- the frequency and intensity of individual aircraft events; or
- the conditions future residents would experience during nighttime hours.

A cumulative noise index may therefore suggest a degree of residential compatibility that does not reflect actual lived conditions, particularly when aircraft events occur at short intervals during hours normally reserved for sleep.

Environmental-health research has associated chronic aircraft-noise exposure with sleep disturbance and fragmentation, cardiovascular stress responses, reduced well-being and effects on children's learning and concentration.

These concerns cannot be adequately addressed solely through warning clauses, closed windows or conventional building insulation. Such measures do not protect outdoor amenity areas, permit residents to comfortably open their windows or address the effects of repeated nighttime events on sleep continuity.

The Pearson Accountability Alliance does not oppose housing, affordable housing or responsible development in principle. However, residential development should not be approved on the basis of legacy forecasts whose intended forecasting horizons have long elapsed, particularly when current measured evidence demonstrates materially different environmental conditions.

Financial incentives and the City's inconsistent position

The Pearson Accountability Alliance previously raised concerns regarding the financial incentives associated with 3100 Weston Road in correspondence sent to Councillor Perruzza and relevant City officials on March 16, 2026.

No substantive response was received, and the procedural, financial and environmental questions raised in that correspondence remain unresolved.

According to information previously provided by City Planning:

- the only active planning application for the property concerns a Phase 1 proposal consisting of three blocks of stacked townhouses containing approximately 125 units;
- the larger development concept associated with the Rental Housing Supply

Program incentives contemplated approximately 480 units;

- the larger 480-unit concept had not been deemed a complete planning application under the Planning Act because the required application fee had not been paid; and
- despite the absence of a complete planning application for the larger concept, Council enacted By-law 1113-2025 authorizing municipal financial incentives associated with residential development at the property.

The City is now directing its lawyers and planners to attend the Ontario Land Tribunal and oppose the active 125-unit application.

This sequence is difficult to reconcile:

- Council approved a by-law authorizing financial incentives associated with residential development at 3100 Weston Road.
- The approximately 480-unit development concept associated with those incentives had not completed the formal planning application process.
- The only active planning application for the property concerns a materially different proposal of approximately 125 units.
- The City is now taking the position that the active residential application should not be approved in its current form.
- Council is therefore opposing the only active residential proposal for the property while leaving previously authorized financial incentives associated with residential development at the same property unresolved.

The concern is not that the 125-unit and 480-unit proposals are identical. They are not. The concern is that Council authorized financial incentives connected with a larger residential proposal before that proposal completed the ordinary planning review process, while the City is now opposing the only formal residential application before it. It makes little sense for Council to authorize financial incentives supporting residential development at 3100 Weston Road while simultaneously directing City staff to oppose the only active residential application for the property, particularly when the larger development concept associated with the incentives has not completed the formal planning review process.

This raises serious questions about:

- how the incentives were authorized before the planning suitability of the property had been resolved;
- whether the larger proposal underwent the necessary planning, technical, aircraft-noise, public-health and land-use compatibility reviews;
- whether the contemplated 480-unit proposal remains active;
- whether it has since entered the formal planning process;
- how the 480-unit concept relates to the current 125-unit application;

- whether a municipal capital facility agreement has been executed;
- whether any development-charge exemption or other financial benefit has taken effect;
- the estimated value, conditions and present legal status of the incentives;
- whether the incentives could be applied to a revised proposal, future application or Ontario Land Tribunal settlement; and
- whether current aircraft-noise exposure and airport land-use compatibility were considered before By-law 1113-2025 was approved.

Council should not oppose the active residential application while leaving previously authorized financial incentives associated with residential development at the same property in place without a clear public explanation.

Prior request to suspend implementation

In the March 16 correspondence, the Pearson Accountability Alliance requested that Council review and, if appropriate, temporarily suspend the implementation of By-law 1113-2025 pending confirmation that airport land-use compatibility and current aircraft-noise exposure conditions had been properly evaluated.

That request remains unanswered and is now especially relevant given the City's decision to oppose the current application before the Ontario Land Tribunal.

A temporary suspension would not prevent an appropriate proposal from proceeding. It would ensure that municipal financial support does not advance ahead of the planning, environmental-health and public-safety assessments required to establish whether residential development is suitable for this location.

It would also help protect the City and future residents from the consequences of proceeding based on incomplete planning information or outdated aircraft-noise assumptions.

Requested action

The Pearson Accountability Alliance respectfully asks City Council to:

1. Adopt the recommendations in Item EY32.5 and direct the City Solicitor and appropriate City staff to oppose the current application before the Ontario Land Tribunal.
2. Direct the City Solicitor and appropriate planning staff to review the attached Pearson Accountability Alliance report and determine the appropriate procedural means of placing the current measured aircraft-noise evidence before the Ontario Land Tribunal as part of the City's land-use compatibility position.
3. Require an updated, independent and site-specific aircraft-noise and environmental-health assessment that considers actual measured conditions, nighttime event frequency, concentrated flight routing and projected growth in

aircraft operations.

4. Ensure that any settlement or revised proposal is not based solely on historic NEF contours, generic warning clauses or conventional indoor-noise mitigation measures.
5. Consider whether it is responsible to introduce additional residents, including children and other vulnerable individuals, into a location where persistent nighttime disturbance has already been documented.
6. Direct appropriate City staff to report publicly on the status, estimated value, conditions and intended application of the municipal incentives authorized under By-law 1113-2025.
7. Confirm whether a municipal capital facility agreement has been executed or whether any development-charge exemption or other financial benefit has taken effect.
8. Require staff to explain the relationship between the contemplated 480-unit affordable-housing development associated with the incentives and the current 125-unit application before the Ontario Land Tribunal.
9. Explain how Council came to authorize financial incentives associated with residential development at the property before the larger development concept had completed the formal planning application and technical review process.
10. Temporarily suspend any further implementation of By-law 1113-2025, to the extent legally and administratively possible, until the associated development has completed the appropriate planning review and its airport land-use compatibility and current aircraft-noise exposure have been properly assessed.
11. Ensure that no settlement, revised proposal or further municipal financial support proceeds until the relationship between the development proposals, the financial arrangements and the environmental suitability of the site have been fully disclosed and considered by Council.

Future residents should not discover only after purchasing or occupying their homes that the environmental conditions affecting the property were known and measured before the development was approved.

Council now has an opportunity to resolve the inconsistency between its earlier financial-incentive decision and its current planning position, and to ensure that the City's actions reflect present-day environmental evidence, transparent financial decision-making and responsible long-term land-use planning.

Please include these comments and the accompanying supporting materials in the public record for Item EY32.5 and provide them to the City Solicitor and appropriate City planning, housing and public-health staff involved in this matter.

Additional aircraft-noise monitoring data, operational records and supporting documentation are publicly available through the Pearson Accountability Alliance's

Evidence Hub at pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Fabio Ovettoni

Founder & Director

Pearson Accountability Alliance

info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

Independent, evidence-based research and public education
on the health, safety, and environmental impacts of Toronto
Pearson Airport.

Attachments:

1. Aircraft Noise & Public Health Context – Proposed Development at 3100 Weston Road: Report prepared in relation to the Ontario Land Tribunal proceeding, May 2026
2. March 16, 2026 correspondence regarding By-law 1113-2025 and the requested suspension of financial incentives
3. Supporting material originally attached to the March 16, 2026 correspondence regarding By-law 1113-2025
4. City Planning correspondence confirming reliance on the 2000 NEF and 1996 NEP contour mapping for the review of 3100 Weston Road



Aircraft Noise & Public Health Context

Proposed Development – 3100 Weston Road

Submission to Toronto Planning

February 2026

Executive Summary: Evidence-Based Land Use Review

Proposed Development – 3100 Weston Road

1. Purpose and Scope

This submission, prepared by the **Pearson Accountability Alliance**, provides thirteen months of continuous measured evidence of aircraft-noise exposure (January 2025 – January 2026) in immediate proximity to the proposed development at **3100 Weston Road**.

The material is submitted to Toronto Planning to ensure that the public record reflects **current measured exposure conditions** rather than reliance on historic theoretical projections. The attached monthly summaries represent a structured subset of a substantially larger evidence base documenting aircraft-noise exposure, operational patterns, and environmental-health context in communities surrounding Toronto Pearson International Airport.

A comprehensive public evidence repository is available at:
pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

2. Limitations of Historic NEF-Based Planning Assumptions

Historic planning decisions affecting lands surrounding Toronto Pearson Airport have relied on **Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF)** modeling frameworks developed decades ago.

Several limitations are relevant to the present site:

A quarter-century gap

The NEF contours used to guide residential suitability for this location are approximately a quarter-century old and do not reflect contemporary operational concentration or routing patterns.

Legacy modeling architecture

The NEF framework originated in the 1970s and was not designed to capture cumulative overnight disturbance, clustered high-frequency aircraft movements, or current operational intensity.

Averaging vs. lived exposure

While NEF relies on 24-hour averaged values, recent monitoring shows repeated nighttime exceedances and dense clusters of aircraft events that materially affect sleep continuity and daily functioning.

For example, January 2026 recorded more than **1,100 nighttime exceedances**, with events occurring on every night of the month.

3. Measured Conditions: Acacia Park Monitoring Evidence

The evidence presented is grounded in objective data from the **GTAA's own Noise Monitoring Terminal (NMT)** at Acacia Park, located in immediate proximity to the development area.

Objective data source

All measurements referenced are derived from the airport authority's own monitoring infrastructure.

High-intensity events

Peak aircraft-noise events reached approximately **95.8 dB** (December 2025), representing sound-energy levels orders of magnitude above commonly cited nighttime guidelines near 45 dB.

Event density

Median intervals between nighttime aircraft events have been measured as low as **1.7 minutes**, conditions that may prevent sustained protected sleep windows for residents.

These measured conditions indicate persistent overnight exposure patterns that differ materially from historic planning assumptions.

4. Health and Development Considerations

Environmental-health research has identified associations between aircraft-noise exposure and:

- sleep disturbance and sleep fragmentation
- cardiovascular stress responses
- reduced overall well-being
- impaired classroom concentration and learning capacity in children

- localized air-quality impacts, including exposure to ultrafine particles associated with aircraft operations

Chronic nighttime disturbance combined with daytime exposure has implications for both adult health and pediatric development. These factors are relevant when evaluating long-term residential suitability at the proposed site.

5. Planning Context

Measured conditions documented in 2025–2026 suggest that current exposure patterns in the vicinity of 3100 Weston Road may fall outside assumptions historically associated with **NEF 25–30 residential suitability frameworks**.

The attached summaries are submitted to ensure that contemporary evidence is available for consideration in planning deliberations and within the public record.

6. Evidentiary Record

This submission places on record that measured aircraft-noise exposure data from the GTAA’s Acacia Park monitor demonstrates conditions materially different from those assumed in historic NEF-based planning frameworks.

Should residential development proceed at this location without requiring a contemporaneous, site-specific assessment of aircraft-noise and environmental-health impacts, such decisions would occur in the context of the documented exposure conditions summarized herein. This statement is provided to ensure that current measured evidence forms part of the planning record and decision-making context.

7. Supporting Documentation

The Pearson Accountability Alliance maintains an extensive publicly accessible evidence repository documenting:

- aircraft-noise monitoring data
- operational patterns
- regulatory correspondence
- environmental-health context

The attached monthly summaries represent a curated subset of this larger documented record.

8. Projected Intensification of Aircraft Operations

Public materials and long-range planning projections released by the Greater Toronto Airports Authority indicate that aircraft movements and passenger volumes at Toronto Pearson are expected to increase substantially over the coming decades, with planning scenarios anticipating a potential **doubling of traffic by approximately 2037**.

For communities already experiencing persistent overnight aircraft disturbance and dense clusters of aircraft events, such projections carry significant implications. Current measured conditions demonstrate repeated nighttime exceedances and limited opportunity for sustained sleep continuity. A substantial increase in aircraft operations would reasonably be expected to intensify these conditions.

Residents in affected areas have little practical ability to mitigate aircraft-noise exposure within their homes. As a result, projected growth in operations represents not only a future planning scenario but a foreseeable escalation of existing environmental burdens.

Approving new residential development in areas already experiencing documented aircraft-noise exposure may embed future occupants within a trajectory of increasing environmental and health stressors over time. The cumulative effect of intensified operations would be expected to amplify sleep disruption, physiological stress, and impacts on children's learning environments.

The evidence presented herein reflects current measured conditions; projected operational growth suggests that these impacts are likely to increase rather than diminish over the lifespan of any residential development approved at this location.

Appendix: Monthly Monitoring Summaries

This appendix contains 13 months of continuous measured aircraft-noise data (January–December 2025 and January 2026) recorded by the GTAA’s own Noise Monitoring Terminal at Acacia Park in proximity to the proposed 3100 Weston Road development site. These summaries document current exposure conditions and are provided to support evidence-based planning review.

All measurements are derived from the Greater Toronto Airports Authority’s own Noise Monitoring Terminal (NMT) located at Acacia Park, providing an objective record of current aircraft-noise exposure conditions. The summaries are presented in chronological order to support evidence-based planning review and the public record.

Noise Impact Summary: January 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	11,276 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	1,160 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 30 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 70.6 dB Max: 89.7 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	3h 42m 55s (122 events)	1h 22m 04s (36 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 26m 35s (355 events)	1h 23m 50s (37 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	18h 28m 07s (439 events)	3h 10m 17s (46 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: February 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	8,317 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	876 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 24 of 28 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 2.0 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 70.0 dB Max: 95.2 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	4h 18m 21s (138 events)	1h 39m 32s (45 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	14h 10m 54s (366 events)	3h 20m 38s (63 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	19h 32m 25s (432 events)	3h 20m 38s (63 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: March 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	9,491 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	1,339 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 29 of 31 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 71.0 dB Max: 92.5 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	4h 16m 33s (144 events)	1h 26m 38s (50 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	11h 46m 45s (342 events)	3h 15m 30s (75 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	19h 11m 34s (472 events)	3h 15m 30s (75 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: April 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	8,949 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	1,139 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 29 of 30 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 70.9 dB Max: 93.2 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	5h 21m 00s (180 events)	0h 48m 41s (28 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 51m 42s (402 events)	1h 54m 20s (41 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 22m 31s (473 events)	2h 29m 41s (45 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: May 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	7,374 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	776 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 28 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 71.3 dB Max: 89.0 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	4h 48m 41s (164 events)	0h 27m 39s (24 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 31m 48s (386 events)	1h 54m 08s (40 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	15h 38m 39s (426 events)	1h 54m 08s (40 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: June 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	9,872 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	1,287 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 27 of 30 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 70.4 dB Max: 88.1 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	5h 28m 33s (185 events)	1h 04m 36s (29 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	15h 29m 03s (379 events)	1h 49m 46s (43 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	19h 25m 13s (491 events)	2h 16m 43s (49 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: July 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	10,581 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	1,074 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 30 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.7 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 70.4 dB Max: 93.7 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	5h 14m 55s (182 events)	1h 04m 58s (26 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 18m 36s (396 events)	2h 17m 50s (44 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 56m 59s (524 events)	2h 36m 46s (48 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: August 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	9,012 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	944 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 27 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.8 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 70.4 dB Max: 83.5 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	5h 51m 00s (193 events)	1h 14m 53s (39 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	15h 39m 14s (429 events)	1h 32m 03s (45 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	19h 07m 36s (511 events)	1h 32m 03s (45 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: September 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	8,242 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	889 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 27 of 30 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.8 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 70.3 dB Max: 87.7 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	7h 15m 04s (235 events)	1h 55m 26s (59 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 16m 04s (389 events)	1h 55m 26s (59 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 15m 16s (451 events)	1h 55m 26s (59 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: October 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	7,772 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	905 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 28 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 70.9 dB Max: 85.6 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	7h 38m 50s (260 events)	0h 24m 28s (24 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	14h 42m 21s (380 events)	1h 36m 29s (33 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 54m 41s (481 events)	2h 11m 02s (39 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: November 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	10,213 airplane noise events detected.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Night Limit Violations	1,068 events above the 45 dB threshold.
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 28 of 30 nights.
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 2.0 minutes.
Night Intensity	Median: 70.6 dB Max: 88.4 dB.

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	7h 24m 05s (241 events)	1h 27m 34s (44 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	13h 18m 40s (362 events)	1h 59m 06s (54 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 56m 29s (446 events)	1h 59m 06s (54 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Noise Impact Summary: December 2025

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics		
Metric Category	Recorded Observation	
Monthly Event Count	10,283 airplane noise events detected.	
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.	
Night Limit Violations	1,144 events above the 45 dB threshold.	
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 30 of 31 nights.	
Density of Noise	Median gap between events is 1.9 minutes.	
Night Intensity	Median: 70.2 dB Max: 95.8 dB.	
Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)		
Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	7h 55m 05s (246 events)	1h 01m 13s (33 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	16h 31m 38s (428 events)	3h 01m 03s (63 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	17h 49m 45s (511 events)	3h 01m 03s (63 events)
Scientific Impact Transparency		
Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).	
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.	
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.	

Noise Impact Summary: January 2026

--- Acacia Park

Official report for community transparency and policy review.

Key Monthly Metrics

Metric Category	Recorded Observation
Monthly Event Count	10,080 airplane noise events detected (day + night).
Day Event Count	8,585 day events detected.
Night Event Count	1,495 night-window events detected (11:00 PM–7:00 AM).
Missing dB Values	3,548 events in this export have no dB value reported.
Night Observation	11:00 PM to 7:00 AM analysis window.
Day Limit Violations	5,430 day events above the 55 dB threshold (where dB reported).
Night Limit Violations	1,102 night-window events above the 45 dB threshold (where dB reported).
Frequency of Impact	Exceedances occurred on 31 of 31 nights (where dB reported).
Nighttime Median Gap	2.2 minutes (median gap between night-window events).
Daytime Median Gap	1.9 minutes (median gap between daytime events).
Night Intensity	Median: 71.0 dB Max: 86.7 dB (where dB reported).

Sustained Noise Sequences (Event Trains)

Max Gap Allowed	Full Day Max Duration	Night Hours Only
Events ≤ 5 min apart	7h 2m 12s (231 events)	2h 4m 33s (57 events)
Events ≤ 10 min apart	15h 27m 32s (412 events)	2h 39m 58s (61 events)
Events ≤ 15 min apart	19h 12m 55s (476 events)	2h 48m 50s (48 events)

Scientific Impact Transparency

Loudness Perception	A 75 dB event is perceived as 300% LOUDER than daytime limits (55dB) and 700% LOUDER than nighttime limits (45dB).
Physical Sound Energy	Each 75 dB event contains 1,000 TIMES more physical sound energy than the nighttime safety limit.
Sleep Protection	The consistency of nightly exceedances indicates that there is currently no protected sleep window for residents.

Fabio Ovettoni

From: info
Sent: March 16, 2026 09:45
To: 'councillor_perruzza@toronto.ca'
Cc: tyler.marr@toronto.ca; 'clerk@toronto.ca'; 'publichealth@toronto.ca'; 'Banani.Afsana@toronto.ca'; 'boh@toronto.ca'; Alex Teixeira; 'cityplanning@toronto.ca'
Subject: Request for Council Review – By-law 1113-2025 (3100 Weston Road Development)
Attachments: PAA_3100_Weston_FINAL_Submission.pdf

Note to the City Clerk

I respectfully request that this correspondence and the attached supporting materials be entered into the official public record associated with the planning file for 3100 Weston Road, and that it be circulated to the appropriate City divisions and relevant committees responsible for planning, housing, and public health oversight.

Councillor Perruzza,

I am writing regarding **By-law 1113-2025** and the City's authorization of financial incentives under the **Rental Housing Supply Program (RHSP)** for the proposed development at **3100 Weston Road**.

Recent correspondence with City Planning indicates that the only active planning application currently under review for the site relates to a **Phase 1 proposal consisting of three blocks of stacked townhouses totaling approximately 125 units**. Planning staff have also confirmed that the larger development concept associated with the RHSP incentives — approximately **480 units** — was never deemed a complete planning application under the Planning Act because the required application fee was never paid.

This raises an important procedural question.

City Council has authorized financial incentives associated with a significantly larger development concept, yet that concept has not proceeded through the normal development review process. As a result, it remains unclear whether key technical considerations were fully evaluated prior to the approval of **By-law 1113-2025**.

Several community members and local organizations have also expressed interest in understanding how the City evaluated **airport land-use compatibility** for this site, particularly given its proximity to operations at **Toronto Pearson International Airport**.

Federal guidance, including **Transport Canada's publication TP 1247 – Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports**, establishes how municipalities evaluate residential development in areas affected by aircraft noise exposure through the use of **Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF)** contours. Given the proximity of the 3100 Weston Road site to Pearson flight paths, it would be prudent to confirm that appropriate airport compatibility analysis has been conducted before financial incentive agreements proceed.

It is also relevant that the **NEF contour mapping currently referenced for Pearson Airport dates back roughly a quarter century**, raising reasonable questions about whether the underlying modelling continues to reflect present operational conditions.

In addition, recent monitoring data derived from the **Greater Toronto Airports Authority's Noise Monitoring Terminal (NMT) located at Acacia Park** has documented current aircraft noise exposure conditions in proximity to the site. These measured conditions raise additional questions regarding whether historic planning assumptions continue to reflect present-day operational realities.

Because municipalities must have regard to matters of **provincial interest under the Planning Act**, including the protection of public health and safety, confirming airport land-use compatibility before implementing financial incentives would help ensure that Council's decision-making remains consistent with provincial planning obligations.

In addition, confirming that the appropriate planning review process has been completed prior to implementing financial incentive agreements would help ensure that the City is **protected from potential future liability arising from approvals that may not have fully addressed environmental exposure considerations**.

Furthermore, as **By-law 1113-2025 designates the project as a municipal capital facility for affordable housing**, confirming the suitability of the site for residential use prior to implementing the incentive agreement would help ensure that Council's designation continues to serve its intended municipal purpose.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that City Council consider **reviewing, and if appropriate temporarily suspending, the implementation of By-law 1113-2025** pending confirmation that airport land-use compatibility and current aircraft noise exposure conditions have been properly evaluated.

Such a step would not prevent the project from proceeding. Rather, it would help ensure that the City's decision-making remains aligned with federal guidance and that future residents are not placed in areas where environmental exposure risks have not been adequately assessed.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further should it be helpful, and I would be happy to provide additional information if Council undertakes a review.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.



Fabio Ovettoni

Founder & Director

Pearson Accountability Alliance

info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

Independent, evidence-based research and public education on the health, safety, and environmental impacts of Toronto Pearson Airport.

Fabio Ovettoni

From: info
Sent: March 16, 2026 09:45
To: 'councillor_perruzza@toronto.ca'
Cc: tyler.marr@toronto.ca; 'clerk@toronto.ca'; 'publichealth@toronto.ca'; 'Banani.Afsana@toronto.ca'; 'boh@toronto.ca'; Alex Teixeira; 'cityplanning@toronto.ca'
Subject: Request for Council Review – By-law 1113-2025 (3100 Weston Road Development)
Attachments: PAA_3100_Weston_FINAL_Submission.pdf

Note to the City Clerk

I respectfully request that this correspondence and the attached supporting materials be entered into the official public record associated with the planning file for 3100 Weston Road, and that it be circulated to the appropriate City divisions and relevant committees responsible for planning, housing, and public health oversight.

Councillor Perruzza,

I am writing regarding **By-law 1113-2025** and the City's authorization of financial incentives under the **Rental Housing Supply Program (RHSP)** for the proposed development at **3100 Weston Road**.

Recent correspondence with City Planning indicates that the only active planning application currently under review for the site relates to a **Phase 1 proposal consisting of three blocks of stacked townhouses totaling approximately 125 units**. Planning staff have also confirmed that the larger development concept associated with the RHSP incentives — approximately **480 units** — was never deemed a complete planning application under the Planning Act because the required application fee was never paid.

This raises an important procedural question.

City Council has authorized financial incentives associated with a significantly larger development concept, yet that concept has not proceeded through the normal development review process. As a result, it remains unclear whether key technical considerations were fully evaluated prior to the approval of **By-law 1113-2025**.

Several community members and local organizations have also expressed interest in understanding how the City evaluated **airport land-use compatibility** for this site, particularly given its proximity to operations at **Toronto Pearson International Airport**.

Federal guidance, including **Transport Canada's publication TP 1247 – Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports**, establishes how municipalities evaluate residential development in areas affected by aircraft noise exposure through the use of **Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF)** contours. Given the proximity of the 3100 Weston Road site to Pearson flight paths, it would be prudent to confirm that appropriate airport compatibility analysis has been conducted before financial incentive agreements proceed.

It is also relevant that the **NEF contour mapping currently referenced for Pearson Airport dates back roughly a quarter century**, raising reasonable questions about whether the underlying modelling continues to reflect present operational conditions.

In addition, recent monitoring data derived from the **Greater Toronto Airports Authority's Noise Monitoring Terminal (NMT) located at Acacia Park** has documented current aircraft noise exposure conditions in proximity to the site. These measured conditions raise additional questions regarding whether historic planning assumptions continue to reflect present-day operational realities.

Because municipalities must have regard to matters of **provincial interest under the Planning Act**, including the protection of public health and safety, confirming airport land-use compatibility before implementing financial incentives would help ensure that Council's decision-making remains consistent with provincial planning obligations.

In addition, confirming that the appropriate planning review process has been completed prior to implementing financial incentive agreements would help ensure that the City is **protected from potential future liability arising from approvals that may not have fully addressed environmental exposure considerations**.

Furthermore, as **By-law 1113-2025 designates the project as a municipal capital facility for affordable housing**, confirming the suitability of the site for residential use prior to implementing the incentive agreement would help ensure that Council's designation continues to serve its intended municipal purpose.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that City Council consider **reviewing, and if appropriate temporarily suspending, the implementation of By-law 1113-2025** pending confirmation that airport land-use compatibility and current aircraft noise exposure conditions have been properly evaluated.

Such a step would not prevent the project from proceeding. Rather, it would help ensure that the City's decision-making remains aligned with federal guidance and that future residents are not placed in areas where environmental exposure risks have not been adequately assessed.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further should it be helpful, and I would be happy to provide additional information if Council undertakes a review.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.



Fabio Ovettoni

Founder & Director

Pearson Accountability Alliance

info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

Independent, evidence-based research and public education on the health, safety, and environmental impacts of Toronto Pearson Airport.

Fabio Ovettoni

From: info <info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org>
Sent: March 25, 2026 13:07
To: Tyler Marr
Cc: fabio217@yahoo.com; dhenderson37@live.com; researcher1@sympatico.ca; Alex Teixeira; humberleacommunitygroup@gmail.com; humbersummitresidents@gmail.com; sjohnstoncontracting@gmail.com; vanzuystenstan@gmail.com; sylvia.cappellacci sylvia.cappellacci; samcastiglione1@outlook.com; a.carboni333@gmail.com; info; Lisa Hosale; Thomas Spolsky; Ohi Izirein; jason.thorne@toronto.ca
Subject: RE: Fwd: RE: 3100 Weston CCM

Hello Tyler,

Thank you for your response and for confirming that the City's review relies on the composite of the 2000 NEF and 1996 NEP contour mapping.

As noted, these contours were approved approximately 25 to 30 years ago. I am trying to better understand how their continued use aligns with current planning practice, particularly given the significant evolution in aircraft operations, traffic volumes, and flight patterns over that period.

It is also my understanding that airport planning frameworks and associated governance structures contemplate periodic updates to noise exposure forecasting to reflect changing operational conditions. Based on your response confirming reliance on the 2000 NEF and 1996 NEP contours, I would appreciate clarification on whether any updated forecasting has been produced since that time.

In that context, I would appreciate clarification on the following:

- Whether any updated NEF or equivalent noise modelling has been prepared or requested in support of this application
- Whether contemporary or site-specific noise exposure analysis has been considered as part of the planning review
- Whether the measured data previously provided has been shared with the GTAA, and whether it will be considered in assessing the suitability of the site for residential use
- And how reliance on legacy contour mapping is reconciled with present-day measured conditions, including those reflected in recent monitoring data

My intent is simply to ensure that planning decisions are supported by current and representative information, particularly where long-term residential use is being considered.

Thank you again for your time.



Fabio Ovettoni

Founder & Director
Pearson Accountability Alliance

info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org
pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org

Independent, evidence-based research and public education on the health, safety, and environmental impacts of Toronto Pearson Airport.

From: Tyler Marr <Tyler.Marr@toronto.ca>

Sent: March 23, 2026 17:58

To: sylvia.cappellacci sylvia.cappellacci <sylvia.cappellacci@sympatico.ca>

Cc: fabio217@yahoo.com; dhenderson37@live.com; researcher1@sympatico.ca; Alex Teixeira <Alex.Teixeira@toronto.ca>; humberleacommunitygroup@gmail.com; humbersummitresidents@gmail.com; sjohnstoncontracting@gmail.com; vanzuylenstan@gmail.com; samcastiglione1@outlook.com; a.carboni333@gmail.com; info <info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org>; Lisa Hosale <Lisa.Hosale@toronto.ca>; Thomas Spolsky <Thomas.Spolsky@toronto.ca>; Ohi Izirein <Ohi.Izirein@toronto.ca>

Subject: RE: Fwd: RE: 3100 Weston CCM

Hello Sylvia and Fabio,

I hope all is well.

This is in response to your March 9th 2026 inquiry.

As the City of Toronto, Development Review Division's commenting partner for all things related to the Toronto Pearson Airport, the GTAA land use team provided the following response:

- **What NEF or noise forecast is currently being relied upon for the assessment of the 3100 Weston Rd. development?**

Toronto Pearson has an approved NEF contour map (2000 NEF) as well as an approved NEP contour map (1996 NEP).

Transport Canada's Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) model is the official methodology used currently in Canada to quantify noise exposure in the vicinity of airports for land use planning purposes. The resulting NEF value represents a cumulative noise index which quantifies long-term aircraft noise exposure over a busy summer day when both aircraft noise levels and community sensitivity to noise tend to be at a maximum.

In addition to the number of arrivals and departures at the Airport, the NEF model also takes into consideration the mix of aircraft types used by the operators, the distribution of the arrivals and departures across the various runways and the site specific arrival and departure procedures. To account for the greater sensitivity toward aircraft noise during the night time, the NEF model also applies a penalty (weighting coefficient) to all operations occurring at night.

The resulting NEF values are commonly depicted by means of contour lines connecting points of equal noise exposure. It is important to note that the NEF number associated with a contour line does not represent a decibel level for an individual flight, but rather a cumulative noise index of the overall noise environment which has been correlated to community noise annoyance levels.

Contour maps that forecast noise exposure five to 10 years in the future are referred to as NEF contour maps. Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) contour maps are similar in nature, and produced using the same model, but project noise exposure up to 20 years into the future.

- **What is the date of that forecast or contour mapping?**

Toronto Pearson has an approved NEF contour map (2000 NEF) as well as an approved NEP contour map (1996 NEP). The outer envelope or 'composite', of the two contour maps is used for land use planning purposes, thereby protecting for the worst case of the two noise situations.

- **Whether the City has verified that the forecast reflects current airport operations and projected activity?**

The GTAA's periodic checks of aircraft noise impacts using official NEFCalc metric, confirm that those impacts do not exceed the levels as represented by the envelope of officially approved Pearson Airport composite 2000NEF/1996NEP contours. This is also confirmed in recent years as Pearson's level of operations has not yet reached the pre-COVID (2019) 50.5Mln. annual passengers.

The City relies on the GTAA to provide this information in our review of land use proposals.

Thank you,

Tyler Marr (he/ him), MSc Pl
Planner, Community Planning
Etobicoke York District, North Section
Development Review Division
City of Toronto
416-392-7591

From: sylvia.cappellacci sylvia.cappellacci <sylvia.cappellacci@sympatico.ca>

Sent: March 19, 2026 11:35 AM

To: Tyler Marr <Tyler.Marr@toronto.ca>

Cc: fabio217@yahoo.com; dhenderson37@live.com; researcher1@sympatico.ca; Alex Teixeira <Alex.Teixeira@toronto.ca>; humberleacomunitygroup@gmail.com; humbersummitresidents@gmail.com; sjohnstoncontracting@gmail.com; vanzuylenstan@gmail.com; samcastiglione1@outlook.com; a.carboni333@gmail.com; info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org; Lisa Hosale <Lisa.Hosale@toronto.ca>; Thomas Spolsky <Thomas.Spolsky@toronto.ca>; Ohi Izirein <Ohi.Izirein@toronto.ca>

Subject: [External Sender] Fwd: RE: 3100 Weston CCM

Good morning Tyler we have been advised that Councilor Perruzza is hosting a community meeting regarding 3100 Weston Road on Thursday April 9th.

We would like answers to the questions below by Thursday March 26th (highlighted in yellow). That gives you 3 weeks from when Fabio sent you the email on March 9th to get the information for us which I think is not unreasonable. We require this as a community to proceed with our concerns.

Would you please make this a priority and get back to us?

Thank you

Sylvia Cappellacci

----- Original Message -----

From: fabio217@yahoo.com

To: Tyler.Marr@toronto.ca; dhenderson37@live.com; sylvia.cappellacci@sympatico.ca; researcher1@sympatico.ca; alex.teixeira@toronto.ca;

humberleacommunitygroup@gmail.com; humbersummitresidents@gmail.com;

sjohnstoncontracting@gmail.com; vanzuylenstan@gmail.com;

samcastiglione1@outlook.com; a.carboni333@gmail.com;

info@pearsonaccountabilityalliance.org Cc: Lisa.Hosale@toronto.ca;

Thomas.Spolsky@toronto.ca; Ohi.Izirein@toronto.ca

Sent: Monday, March 9th 2026, 12:03 PM

Subject: RE: 3100 Weston CCM

Hello Tyler,

Thank you for organizing this email thread regarding the 3100 Weston Road rezoning application.

For clarity, I wanted to follow up briefly on the question raised in my earlier email concerning the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) framework being relied upon for planning review.

Planning policies at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels generally rely on NEF forecasts to assess compatibility of residential development near major airports. As many

residents understand, the most commonly referenced Pearson NEF contours appear to date from approximately the year 2000.

Could City Planning please confirm:

- What NEF or noise forecast is currently being relied upon for the assessment of the 3100 Weston Rd. development?
- What is the date of that forecast or contour mapping?
- Whether the City has verified that the forecast reflects current airport operations and projected activity?

For context, I have attached a short background submission prepared through the Pearson Accountability Alliance. The document includes thirteen months of measured aircraft-noise data recorded near the proposed development site using the airport authority's own monitoring system.

I hope this information may be helpful as part of the community discussion and planning review.

Sincerely,
Fabio Ovettoni
Pearson Accountability Alliance

Attachments:

- PAA_3100_Weston_FINAL_Submission.pdf
- City_NEF_Accountability_with_Exhibits.pdf
- 3100 Weston CCM Presentation.pdf

From: Tyler Marr <Tyler.Marr@toronto.ca>

Sent: February 27, 2026 16:54

To: Daryl Henderson <dhenderson37@live.com>; Fabio Ovettoni <fabio217@yahoo.com>; Sylvia <sylvia.cappellacci@sympatico.ca>; Edith George <researcher1@sympatico.ca>

Cc: Lisa Hosale <Lisa.Hosale@toronto.ca>; Thomas Spolsky <Thomas.Spolsky@toronto.ca>; Ohi Izirein <Ohi.Izirein@toronto.ca>

Subject: 3100 Weston CCM

Hello everyone,

There have been a lot of email threads flying around and I wonder if it's best to funnel these community conversations into one.

Please use this email thread for questions and comments regarding the 3100 Weston Road rezoning application (and feel free to add community members as you see fit).

Thank you,

Tyler Marr (he/ him), MSc Pl

Planner, Community Planning

Development Review Division | Etobicoke York District | North Section

City of Toronto

Etobicoke Civic Centre | 399 The West Mall, 3rd Floor, South Block

Toronto, ON M9C 2Y2

416-392-7591

