

From: [Fiona](#)
To: [Clerk](#); [Matt Cook](#)
Subject: [External Sender] Comments for 2026.EY31.3 on April 29, 2026 Etobicoke York Community Council re . KPRI SUBMISSION re 2915 Bloor Street.
Date: April 27, 2026 4:06:10 PM

2026.EY31.3 on April 29, 2026 Etobicoke York Community Council .

2915 Bloor Street West for 29 storeys where 7 storeys PLUS ROOFTOP AMENITIES was permitted by the OLT in the prior case.

The subject lands are currently zoned Bylaw 941-2003 as Limited Commercial Avenues , which controls height and density. The bylaw was created by the city with input from neighborhood ratepayer organizations like the Kingsway Park Ratepayers Inc. to preserve a unique segment of Bloor with a rich history of specific land development style as designed by Robert Home Smith prior to WW1. The streetscape along Bloor was tailored expressly to create the pleasant shopping experience of an English high street.

We vehemently oppose a 29 storey structure slammed into a now mid rise designated neighborhood because there is neither the need nor the desire for it. The constant returning to the OLT to overturn previous decisions is a gross waste of voter-community resources . We are now burdened with excessive costs to fight the infinitely deeper pockets arrayed against us and the neighborhoods we support and preserve with our tax dollars and volunteer hours. The matter has already been decided after a long drawn out very costly fight, at 8 storeys. The demand now for 21 more storeys is grotesque.

The APPLICATION can be denied on the following grounds providing the OLT considers the collapse of the market for such housing forms, the reduction of immigrant numbers being permitted to come to Canada for whom these buildings were devised as residences/ investment opportunities, and the implacable resistance in local communities for the overwhelming distortions such structures inflict on their neighbors. These are not affordable housing options: they answer no social need but greed. Running these applications through the micro-lens of what the provincial laws might airily proscribe for their political advantage is to ignore the larger picture of the greater good governance that voters expect to see delivered.

A. The application is in direct conflict with the site-specific standards in By-law 941-2003, enacted following a dedicated Avenue Study to implement a vision for the Kingsway stretch of Bloor: maximum 6 storeys (18 m) height, maximum FSI of 3.0, mandatory 45-degree angular plane measured from the lot lines of adjacent residential zones to the south, step backs (including a minimum 3.0 m setback at the sixth storey), cornice lines, and rear-lane access. The developer's 29-storey tower + 6-storey podium, FSI ≈ 8.2 , and massive density increase completely override these performance standards. These controls were deliberately chosen to protect the low-rise character of the surrounding residential neighbourhood and ensure compatibility— and a gradual transition over time in built form: precisely the outcome the community expected and was expressly promised.

B. The proposal is patently high-rise, not mid-rise. Toronto's Official Plan (including recent OPA 778 / Avenues Policy Review) and the Mid-Rise Building Design Guidelines direct Avenues intensification to mid-rise buildings (generally 4–8 storeys, or up to 11–14 storeys in limited cases with a 1:1 relationship to right-of-way width). A 29-storey tower on a podium does not achieve a “gradual transition” to the 2-3-storey homes immediately south. It violates

the angular-plane and step-back intent of By-law 941-2003, resulting in excessive overlook, loss of sky view, and privacy impacts for neighboring residents. To add insult to injury, lots on the south side of Bloor are extremely shallow, with no room to buffer the impacts on the unfortunate residents next door. No room for proper rear access, let alone trees or greenery...

C. This site is not a PMTSA/MTSA or growth node) Based on all publicly available data at the time of this statement (e.g.

<https://open.toronto.ca/dataset/minister-approved-major-transit-station-areas/>),

Royal York Station and this segment of Bloor are not designated as a Protected Major Transit Station Area (P/MTSA). There is therefore no Provincial or Official Plan policy basis (under the Growth Plan or OP Section 2.2.3 Avenues policies) for permitting high-rise density and height here. The developer's density jump to FSI ≈ 8.2 relies on general intensification language, but ignores the site-specific zoning and the fact that this stretch was exempted from the broader Avenues & Mid-Rise Buildings Study because it already had its own tailored by-law. Cherry picking like this to force an exception and overturn by precedent an older by law is bad planning. The application cannot be permitted under current legal stipulations.

D. Adverse impacts on the public realm and neighbourhood character (streetscape and shadow) The Kingsway commercial area is defined by 2–3 storey early-20th-century buildings that create a human-scale, village-like environment. A few 4 and 5 storey buildings have been permitted in the past. Introducing a 29-storey tower would utterly distort the street wall, disrupting in the most extreme way the low-rise character, and force an undesirable downtown canyon expanse onto a village green.

E. Earlier proposals on the same or adjacent lands (e.g., the 2017–2019 LPAT case for a 9-storey building at 2915–2917 Bloor) reinforced that By-law 941-2003 and the Bloor-Kingsway Urban Design Guidelines establish the benchmark for “planned context.” The Tribunal noted the 6-storey limit as appropriate. The community supports intensification within that framework (e.g., a well-designed 6–8 storey mid-rise with proper setbacks and transitions) but not a complete departure. Enormous effort was expended to achieve this compromise. To see it dismissed for no other reason than an ownership change of hands and a province wide general change of direction makes a mockery of considered legal and planning decisions.

F: Shadow studies are the primary way to quantify “transition.”

Toronto's Mid-Rise Building Design Guidelines and the Bloor-Kingsway Urban Design Guidelines use shadow diagrams to test whether a building maintains reasonable sunlight on adjacent low-rise properties. A 29-storey tower will produce longer and more intense shadows than a 6–8 storey mid-rise would. The study must show impacts on March 21 / September 21 (equinoxes) and December 21 (worst-case winter day) at hourly intervals. This is strong evidence that the proposal does not achieve a “gradual height transition” to the 3-storey homes south of the site.

G. The “good planning” test under the Planning Act Under s. 2 of the Planning Act, decisions must have regard to matters of provincial interest, be consistent with the PPS (Provincial Policy Statement 2020, particularly the policies on compatible built form and orderly intensification), and conform to the Official Plan. The community is not anti-development: it welcomes responsible mid-rise projects that deliver housing (including affordable/rental units)

while respecting the existing zoning envelope and neighbourhood transition standards. At some point, previously rendered decisions have to have some heft and duration.

This application is a test to see how far it can go in overturning established neighborhoods in the name of commercially viable business opportunities for the few, at the expense of the many. These are not hospitals or social housing or schools to attract the best and brightest from around the world. This is cash register planning at its worst. We rely on the OLT to protect the public interest in the varying textures of different neighborhoods across the city, without slashing and burning the character evolution the landscape sustained over time. We greatly appreciate your review and your protection going forward.

F.T.AMPBELL, PRESIDENT KINGSWAY PARK RATEPAYERS INC.

184 Prince Edward Drive, Etobicoke M8Y 3W9

416-232-243.