

November 24, 2025

Etobicoke York Community Council
Etobicoke Civic Centre
2 Civic Centre Court
Toronto, ON M9C 5A3



Re: 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West Zoning By-law Application Number 23 101352 WET 02 OZ

Dear Chair and Members of the Etobicoke York Community Council,

On behalf of the Richmond Gardens and Princess Anne Residents' Association (RGRRA), and the more than 1,500 residents who have signed our petition, we are expressing our deep concerns for the developers fragmented and piecemeal applications that dismantle the 2021 City-approved plan.

To be clear, we are not opposing growth. The community made consistent, good-faith efforts to collaborate with the developer and in **2021, City Council approved a comprehensive and vibrant development at Richview Plaza that would increase density, deliver affordable housing, and protect retail services and parking.** Unfortunately, not a single unit was built. Instead, the dismantling of the coordinated plan through Committee of Adjustment began almost immediately, followed by a rezoning application to add multiple storeys on top of the two approved 11-storey buildings. To residents, this sequence of actions is both **puzzling** and **deeply concerning**.

We strongly request that Council reject this Rezoning Application for Buildings A & B at 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West for the following reasons:

1. Preserving the retail core is critical
2. Proposed heights and densities cannot be applied to this site
3. A private road is no longer defensible – a public road is required

Importantly, Council does not have a view of the entire site, and how it fails to function, after several applications to COA and a pending OLT appeal (December 10/11 2025) in this rezoning application.

The Site Is Being Broken Apart Through Multiple Uncoordinated Applications

The 2021 plan was approved as a single, integrated mixed-use site with coordinated:

- parking
- loading and servicing
- access and internal circulation
- construction sequencing

Since then, Trinity's ongoing **run** to the Committee of Adjustment with numerous applications, and further its OLT appeal for Building C have:

- added 130 units to building C, reduced unit mix, decreased two and three bedrooms and added 10% studio apartments
- converted the grocery store space to residential
- reduced retail, tenant and visitor parking, and loading

- shifted access and servicing functions
- and now seek to subdivide the internal road into 2–3 separate lots with multiple private owners, though it is the sole access to the retail plaza

This has resulted in a **fragmented** and unpredictable site plan that contradicts the integrated approach approved by Council and required under the Build Toronto (**CreateTO**) Purchase Agreement, including the “**no appeal**” condition to the Ontario Land Tribunal. It has also created significant confusion for Committee of Adjustment members and for the community.

This coupled with the fact that the developer received the site through a **sole-source land transfer from CreateTO** based on maintaining the integrity of the 2021 plan, has led to **distrust** rather than partnership.

1. Preserving the Retail Core is Critical

Richview Plaza is the neighbourhood’s **only** walkable retail hub and serves thousands of residents, including seniors, families, and visitors. The 2021 zoning by-law required a minimum of 80,191 sq ft of non-residential space, with a planned retail program including a full grocery store (an additional 37,000 sq. ft) and day-to-day services. That framework is now being steadily dismantled and the retail cuts jeopardize the viability of the plaza. Since 2021, Trinity has:

- removed the grocery store
- cut a whole floor of retail space in Building C
- removed loading
- now proposes reducing retail in Buildings A & B from 14,900 sq ft to only 5,528 sq ft
- proposes cutting retail and visitor parking through the OLT

Across the full site, this results in retail that falls well below the minimum non-residential GFA required by By-law 834-2021, in fact it **falls short by 13,000** square feet and far below what the community needs to support a functional, walkable centre.

Retail cannot survive when parking, loading, access routes, and circulation are being repeatedly altered through separate minor variance applications. Retail tenants will not lease space in a plaza where parking is insufficient and circulation, frontage, and access remain uncertain or fragmented.

2. Proposed Heights and Densities Cannot Be Applied to This Site

There is no Official Plan policy basis or neighbourhood precedent to support towers of 24 and 29 storeys directly abutting a low-density Neighbourhoods designation.

Key Facts and Policy References:

a. The Official Mid-Rise Building Design Guidelines (2024) confirm:

- Requires contextual built form respecting adjacent Neighbourhoods (OP 3.1.3.1–3.1.3.4)
- Mid-rise - generally no taller than the width of the right-of-way (Eglinton - 45 m ROW -14 storeys max).
- Buildings must step back and transition to stable low-rise neighbourhoods.

There is no precedent of towers on Eglinton in close proximity to this site. It is to be noted the existing towers on Eglinton (e.g., the former Plant World site) abut other apartment properties or parkland - not low-density residential homes. This site is the only location where towers would directly abut residential homes.

b. The 2021 Council-Approved Plan Already Accounted for the Eglinton LRT (ECWE)

The current approval of 11, 11, and 12 storeys was based explicitly on the future Crosstown West LRT and is consistent with:

- OP 2.2.3 Avenues: Re-urbanizing Arterial Corridors
- OP 4.5 Mixed Use Areas – Mid-Rise Form

The LRT was already factored into the approved height. Nothing has changed.

c. This Location Is Not a Delineated PMTSA /MTSA Station

This site is not a Protected MTSA, nor a Council-adopted MTSA (Per OP Chapter 8). MTSA policies apply only after Council adoption and Minister approval. The MTSA study for the Kipling LRT station has not begun, meaning:

- No confirmed radius
- No densities
- No road network
- No infrastructure modelling

Therefore, applying MTSA-level tower heights is **premature** and **contrary** to OP implementation requirements. This is **further acknowledged by staff** (Pg.9), stating:

- This site is not an approved MTSA or PMTSA
- MTSA boundaries west of Keele Station do not exist yet
- The Minister has not brought them into force

Despite this, the staff report relies heavily on planned context tied to a future ECWE LRT station. These are speculative assumptions, **not approved policy**. As was stated above the, LRT was already factored into the approved height in 2021.

Even if Kipling LRT station was eventually an MTSA, the proposed towers exceed minimum recommendations for current MTSA's located **450m from a station**.

- Towers of 24 and 29 storeys at this site would exceed the scale of comparable MTSA's by a significant margin.

d. The Avenues Policy Is the Only In-Force Applicable Policy (OP 2.2.3)

Eglinton Avenue West is an Avenues corridor in the Official Plan. The Avenues policies explicitly support:

- Mid-rise, not towers
- Development that “respects and reinforces the existing physical character of Neighbourhoods” (OP 2.2.3.3)
- Incremental, context-based intensification
- There is no Avenues policy basis to support 24–29 storey towers on this site

3. A Public Road Is Required – A Private Road Is No Longer Defensible

A private road was only marginally acceptable in 2021 because Council approved a single, coordinated, mid-rise plan under one owner, with one circulation system, one parking system, and roughly 570 units. Those conditions no longer exist. Since then, severances, variances, and repeated OLT and Committee of Adjustment filings have dismantled that framework.

The private-road model is no longer viable because the site has changed fundamentally:

- Multiple future owners are now proposed
- Separate underground garages are expected beneath the access route, built at different times
- Heights and density are proposed to double or triple
- Years of phased construction will occur with no guaranteed coordination

Meanwhile, thousands of daily trips—seniors, residents, shoppers, product and food deliveries, transportation vehicles such as Uber, Wheel-Trans, cyclists, pedestrians and emergency services —would depend on a narrow private laneway.

A private laneway cannot support a public-serving retail plaza:

- Access can be restricted, rerouted, or closed at any time.
- The City cannot enforce pedestrian safety, emergency access, snow/ice clearing, or long-term maintenance.
- The proposed “L-shaped right-of-way” is a driveway within a fragmented private development—not a City road or network link serving public access to neighbourhood retail, services and amenities.

Official Plan Policy 3.1.1.9 presumes new streets **must** be public unless a private street is suitable. Given :

- the severances, multi-owner configuration,
- the intensity of mixed uses,
- the reliance on safe public access to retail, and
- the adjacent seniors’ residence,

A private road is **not** appropriate. Only a City- owned public road can guarantee permanent access, safety, and reliable emergency response, and protect Richview Plaza’s long-term retail viability.

Finally, EYCC directed Staff in June 2025 to evaluate a public road, yet this has not been addressed. We understand there may be water catch basins on the site, but these typical encumbrances (like stormwater tanks, utility easements) are resolved across Toronto every day—they are **not valid barriers** to public ownership.

Council Is Being Asked to Approve Towers A & B Without Understanding How Buildings C & D Will Function

While Buildings A & B are before Council for rezoning, Buildings C & D - the retail core - are being altered through separate processes outside Council’s purview. These changes directly affect:

- access to the plaza
- loading for retail
- pedestrian connections
- safety along the park and seniors’ residence

- 211 units of the 370 units in “C) parking supply significantly reduced and spillover over to local streets
- overall retail and site viability

Council is being asked to approve half the site without seeing how the other half will work. This is contrary to the coordinated plan that was approved in 2021 and required by the City’s own agreements.

Risks to the City and Community

Approving Buildings A & B without integrated approvals for Buildings C & D creates significant risks:

- undermines the Official Plan’s direction for coordinated mixed-use redevelopment
- threatens the viability of the only walkable retail centre
- creates unsafe and unpredictable circulation patterns
- leaves essential services without adequate parking, loading, or access
- exposes the public to safety issues if a privately owned multi-party road is not maintained
- and may leave the City liable for approving a fragmented system that cannot function as intended

In summary, the community is asking Council to uphold planning integrity and protect a vibrant integrated development that serves as the sole walkable retail for the neighbourhood and the thousands of new residents to come, in addition to the tens of thousands of residents across Etobicoke.

Based on the **evidence** above, we respectfully request that Council:

- **Reject** the rezoning application for Buildings A & B
- **Maintain** heights and density (FSI) consistent with approved planning polices and the surrounding community with the understanding MTSAs do not yet apply.
- **Preserve** the agreed upon 2021 retail commitments and parking, which are essential to long-term retail viability at Richview Plaza.
- **Direct** staff to secure a public road under OP 3.1.1.9. An L-shaped private driveway is not a road and cannot serve this multi-block, mixed-use site.
- **Affirm** that potential future MTSAs-level density cannot be applied on this rezoning application

Our Position on Growth

We have shown a clear willingness to work **collaboratively** with Planning and the applicant to resolve concerns—particularly around parking, tower heights and site functioning but **no** such discussions have occurred. Our approach has always been **proactive, solutions-oriented, and open to dialogue**.

Regards,

Sonia Pace and Luisa Girotto
Co-chairs, RGRRA