

February 16, 2026

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



**Re: 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West - Zoning By-law Amendment 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 communities (RGRRA) and the more than 1,800 residents who have signed our [SaveRichviewPlaza.ca](https://www.savetrichviewplaza.ca) petition, we thank Etobicoke York Community Council (EYCC) for its November 26, 2025 direction that the applicant engage with residents, City Planning Staff, and the local Councillor *"in an effort to resolve the community's concerns with the application, and to report on any revisions."* Council's direction was taken seriously by the RGRRA. Unfortunately, despite good-faith efforts by the community, the applicant did not want to consider any amendments to the application.

In response to that direction, the RGRRA organized two collaboration meetings with the applicant:

1. December 2025: an initial meeting to clearly outline the community's top concerns, and identify potential areas of compromise; and
2. January 2026: a follow up meeting at which the applicant confirmed they have no intention of collaborating with the community and would make no changes to the proposed application for a Zoning Bylaw Amendment.

Specifically, the applicant refused to:

1. Modify the proposed built form to reduce heights and density (FSI) to be consistent with the City of Toronto's recently approved Avenues policy and the surrounding community context, while agreeing MTSAs do not yet apply to this site.
2. Preserve the agreed upon Site-Specific Zoning By-law 834-2021 retail commitments and associated parking spaces, which are vital for the community's retail destination that is Richview Square.
3. Incorporate a **public road** consistent with City's **OP 3.1.1.9**. as the proposed narrow 8.5 m L-shaped private lane cannot adequately serve this multi-block, mixed-use development and integrate with the existing community and public roadways. The applicant responded negatively and refused to consider this option.

As a result, EYCC's November 26, 2026, direction remains unfulfilled.

## Our Request of Council

**A public road for new developments is required under the City's Official Plan policies.** A private lane is not defensible for this established and evolving critical community retail and residential development, which is proposed to accommodate approximately 1,030 new residential units.

We respectfully request Etobicoke Community Council to direct that this application be amended to incorporate reasonable, functional changes that align with approved City policies, that the applicant has refused to consider.

As the application now stands, the internal east-west connection through the site functions as a narrow private lane with a 90-degree turn at 8.5 m, despite now serving a multi-block, mixed use development characterized by: multiple buildings; separate garages and loading areas; extensive retail frontages; and multiple future ownership parcels to be developed at different times.

1. A private lane was only marginally acceptable in 2021 because Council approved one single, coordinated, mid-rise development under one ownership structure, with a unified circulation and parking system, and approximately 570 residential units. Although the RGRRA agreed to this condition it was only as part of a settlement that incorporated significantly less height and residential units than currently requested. Those conditions no longer exist.
2. This is a new rezoning application. The City's Official Plan Policy 3.1.1.9 states: *"New streets will be public streets unless otherwise deemed appropriate by the City. Private streets, where they are deemed to be appropriate, will be designed to connect to and integrate into the broader public street network and meet the design objectives for new public streets"*.
3. The Official Plan therefore establishes a presumption in favor of requiring public street for new developments. A private street may only be considered where it can be demonstrated to be more suitable. That test has not been met. The site has evolved significantly since earlier approvals of Site-Specific By-law 834-2021: It now comprises multiple development parcels and future ownership interests; it supports substantially greater height, density and almost double the number of residential units; it relies on shared internal circulation to serve retail, residential, loading, emergency access, and phasing.
4. Given the severances and multiple future owners of the shared site, construction of the individual buildings occurring at different times with separate garage entrances and loading docks; the greater intensity of mixed uses with 5000-9000 cars per day; the need for safe and uninterrupted public access to the community's retail and services; and the adjacent seniors' residence; a private narrow lane is unacceptable to the community.
5. Separately and additionally, the community has experienced consistent little and no regard from the developer since the day they acquired the site and the CreateTO lands. There is zero evidence to trust the developer will ever respect the community and its needs; case in point, snow from the parking lots was recently illegally dumped at the intersection of Wincott and Waterford on the opposite side of the plaza which blocked visibility at the three-way stop and posed a serious safety risk.
6. Further, the cited encumbrances outlined in the staff report do not constitute valid barriers to require a public street. Several of the constraints relied upon by the applicant are developer-

created, arising from Committee of Adjustment applications and OLT decisions pursued prior to and independent of this rezoning application, despite the applicant having acknowledged RGGRA correspondence in March 2025 advising that the community would be seeking a public road solution. (*See attached RGGRA letter to Trinity below - dated March 20 2025*)

7. Remaining encumbrances—such as stormwater infrastructure and utility easements—are typical conditions routinely addressed and resolved across Toronto and do not meet the threshold required to justify a private road under the Official Plan. Repeated requests by the community for clear confirmation of how these encumbrances preclude a public street have not demonstrated that they satisfy the suitability test for acceptance of a private road instead of a public road.
8. Importantly, **Building C must not dictate the planning framework or circulation structure for the remainder of this multi-block site.** A single building, approved through earlier and numerous variance processes while simultaneously pursuing a new rezoning for the whole of the site, and not yet constructed, cannot override Official Plan direction, or constrain the proper design and function of the overall development. The RGGRA has consistently objected to the piecemeal approach taken by the applicant as the approvals for Building C should have been part of the new rezoning application in order to ensure a comprehensive review of all the changes to ensure an appropriate overall development for the whole of the site.

### **Policy and Precedents support a Public Road over a Private Lane**

The Official Plan establishes a clear and deliberate policy framework to which new streets are presumed to be public, particularly within mixed use developments of this scale and intensity.

The community has reviewed numerous comparable mixed-use developments across the City of Toronto, which consistently confirm that public streets are fundamental components of the public realm. They are prevailing and expected conditions reflecting long standing municipal practice and policy rationale to support integration of new developments within established low-density communities.

Public streets are a fundamental component of the public realm, supporting safe and efficient movement for pedestrians, cyclists, emergency services, and service and delivery function, while ensuring long term functionality, accessibility and governance. We believe Council appreciates adherence to this policy is not discretionary. It is neither a nice to have nor optional, it is a core requirement intended to support complete streets and complete communities.

### **Staff-Identified Options for a Public Road**

Staff in its February 6, 2026 “Status Update Report” assert that the proposed private street is “adequate” because it meets certain dimensional objectives and is subject to public access easements. However, and respectfully, adequacy is not the policy test. The Official Plan does not ask whether a private road can be made to function adequately, it asks whether a private road is more suitable and appropriate than a public one. That burden has not been met.

Staff identify two options for a Public Road for this site which demonstrates that a public road can be achieved on this development site. The RGGRA support the second option which aligns with the City’s standard treatment and expectations to similar sites: the creation of a public right-of way free and clear of above and below -grade encumbrances. As previously stated, the City and the community should not bear

responsibility for the developer-created constraints arising through multiple piecemeal COA applications and appeals. The original encumbrances on the site are routine and as noted by staff **resolvable**.

**Conclusion**

We respectfully request that Community Council amend the draft Zoning By-law to require a public right-of-way with a minimum 20-metre width, together with appropriate setbacks for the three buildings from the public right of way.

It is equally important that the right-of-way and building setbacks function together to create a complete, safe, and durable public street, consistent with the Official Plan, and capable of properly accommodating bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, and safe pedestrian movement.

Respectfully submitted,

Luisa Giroto and Sonia Pace

Co-Chairs, Richmond Gardens Residents and Ratepayers Association

**Attached RGRRA letter below which was received and acknowledged by Trinity Development Group- in March, 2025.**



March 20, 2025

**Via Digital Delivery**

Robert Wells, Vice President, Development and Acquisitions, Trinity Development Group

**Caution re: proceeding with construction of Building C with existing approved floorplate - implications if Public Road required for 250 Wincott Drive and 4620 Eglinton Avenue West File No. 22 136287 WET 02 SA**

Dear Mr. Wells,

The RGRAA represents the Richmond Gardens and Princess Anne communities in this matter. We want to offer you as a courtesy our notice that while the communities remain supportive of the 2021 Mid-Rise approval, we intend to object strenuously to your new rezoning application in all respects.

As part of that objection, we will be asking Council to ensure that any increase in density on the subject lands if regrettably considered by Council will require a full **PUBLIC** road with a right of way of not less than 20m, with public sidewalks, no underground garages, and bicycle lanes. If that cannot be achieved, we would submit no further development should be entertained on the subject lands. To be clear, we will also submit that if this is achieved no further development should be considered for the subject lands.

We provide this notice to you as we are of the understanding you may be proceeding with Building C at this time which floorplate would appear to preclude any public road being possible on your overall site. We offer this notice as a caution to you only.

Please be advised the RGRAA will not object to a modification of the floorplate of Building C to assist you in achieving that objective, providing no attempt is made to increase the height of that building or to otherwise accommodate any "lost" GFA through an alternate expansion of that building. Having said that, we wish to be clear that if that modification is made by Montrin to increase their range of options before Council, the RGRAA and the communities represented will at this juncture remain opposed to any development that increases the GFA over the 2021 approval which of course we all agreed to in settlement.

We trust the foregoing is of assistance to you.

Yours truly,

Sonia Pace  
RGRAA Director

Cc: Peter F. Smith, Partner Bousfields Inc.  
Loralea Tulloch, Senior Planner, Community Planning, Etobicoke York District –North Section  
Councillor Holyday  
Mayor Chow  
RGGRA Directors