

## councilmeeting

---

**From:** Peter Thachuk <peter.thachuk@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** May 18, 2026 12:42 PM  
**To:** councilmeeting  
**Cc:** Mayor Chow; Councillor Crisanti; Councillor Holyday; Councillor Morley; Councillor Perks; Councillor Nunziata; Councillor Pasternak; Councillor Perruzza; Councillor Colle8; Councillor Bravo; Councillor Malik; Councillor Saxe; Councillor Matlow; Councillor Moise; Councillor Fletcher; Councillor Chernos Lin; Councillor Burnside; Councillor Carroll; Councillor Cheng; Councillor Bradford; Councillor Kandavel; Councillor Thompson; Councillor Mantas; Councillor Myers; Councillor Ainslie; Councillor Shan  
**Subject:** [External Sender] In SUPPORT of Scarborough Community Council Rejection of : Item 2026.SC31.2 - 3718 and 3730 Kingston Road SC31.2 -3718-3730 Kingston Rd.  
**Categories:** Communication (Supp)

**To:** Toronto City Clerk (councilmeeting@toronto.ca)

**Date:** May 17, 2026

**Subject:** In SUPPORT of Scarborough Community Council Rejection of Item 2026.SC31.2 - 3718 and 3730 Kingston Road

### **Attention: City Clerk and Members of Toronto City Council**

I am writing to formally request that City Council **uphold the Scarborough Community Council's decision** from April 30, 2026, to **refuse** the Zoning By-law Amendment application for **3718 and 3730 Kingston Road (Item SC31.2)**.

While the City Planning Staff Report recommends approval, it fails to address localized infrastructure gaps and represents a severe over-intensification that goes far beyond the intended scale for this irregular 0.6-hectare site. I urge Council to support the democratic decision of the Scarborough Community Council and reject this application based on the following planning grounds:

#### **1. Severe Massing Incompatibility with Adjacent Low-Rise Neighbourhood**

While the City's updated transition standards have moved away from prescriptive angular planes in favour of step-backs, the intent of the Official Plan remains unchanged: new developments must provide an appropriate scale transition to low-rise Neighborhoods. The proposed **24-storey high-rise tower and 7-storey podium** directly abuts a 3-storey residential townhouse development to the north. Many of these directly abutting townhouses have south-facing backyards that will be 7-11 metres to the north of this 24 storey proposal. A fixed setback of 7-11 metres without substantial step-backs at the higher tiers creates an overwhelming, sheer vertical wall (or Cliff) that causes severe overlook, privacy loss, and shadow impacts on these pre-existing low-rise properties.

#### **2. Deficit in On-Site Parking Infrastructure**

The development proposes **only 193 vehicular parking spaces for 419 residential units**. This leaves over 200 units entirely without designated parking. While reducing car dependency is a valid city-wide goal, this specific pocket of Scarborough does not currently possess the high-order, rapid transit

connectivity required to support such a drastic reduction. Forcing hundreds of vehicle-reliant residents to seek parking on Scarborough Golf Club Rd. (the only viable alternative) will create permanent gridlock and a safety hazard on a road that currently has parking issues.

### **3. Premature Density Based on Unfunded Transit Infrastructure**

The staff report heavily relies on the future **Eglinton East Light Rail Transit (EELRT)** network to justify the project's high floor space index (FSI) of 5.25. However, the EELRT extension remains an unfunded, speculative capital project. Approving extreme, high-rise density today based on infrastructure that will not be operational for years (if ever) places an immediate, unmanageable burden on the current surface transit and road networks.

### **4. Aggressive Escalation from Initial Community Consultation**

This development was initially presented to the community as a 12-to-14-storey mid-rise project. Doubling the height to a 24-storey skyscraper is a drastic departure. Local schools, emergency services, and utility networks were never assessed to absorb this level of hyper-density on a single corner lot. Similar lots and builds in the vicinity are OP designated as 'missing middle' with heights restricted to the width of Kingston Rd.

### **5. Inconsistency with the Developer's Stated B Corp Mandate**

The developer, TAS Corporation, heavily promotes its status as a "Certified B Corporation," a designation that legally binds a company to balance profit with social responsibility, community benefit, and public accountability. Forcing a 24-storey skyscraper onto a site where it explicitly harms the adjacent low-rise neighbours, while disregarding the unified opposition of numerous community deputations at Community Council, directly contradicts the ethical mandates of a B Corp. Real community stewardship means designing with the neighbourhood, not overriding it for maximum unit yield.

The Scarborough Community Council correctly exercised its oversight by recognizing that the staff report favored broad provincial density targets while ignoring critical, localized planning realities. I urge City Council to stand with Scarborough constituents and vote to **refuse** this rezoning application.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Peter Thachuk

248 Scarborough Golf Club Rd.

Scarborough Ont.

416 524 4452