

February 14, 2026

Via Email: engageio@infrastructureontario.ca

Copy to: Minister.MOI@ontario.ca; Councillor_Ainslie_CO@toronto.ca; info@fotenn.com;
info@zeidler.com; media@infrastructureontario.ca; todd.mccarthy@pc.ola.org

Infrastructure Ontario

Attn.: Guildwood GO TOC Project Team
Suite 2000, 1 Dundas Street West
Toronto, ON M5G 1Z3

Re: Guildwood GO Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) — Submission from the Guildwood Village Community Association

Dear Infrastructure Ontario Project Team,

On behalf of the Guildwood Village Community Association (GVCA), which represents approximately 3,400 households immediately surrounding the Guildwood GO Station, we are submitting our formal comments on the Guildwood GO TOC concept and the consultation process that has happened to date.

We support new homes within a mixed-use concept near transit stations when they are context-sensitive, infrastructure-ready, and deliver tangible community benefits. The current concept—six towers ranging from 30 to 60 storeys, ~2,534 units on the north GO parking lot—does not meet those tests and requires substantial revision and phasing conditions. [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](mailto:media@infrastructureontario.ca)], [urbantoronto.ca]

The process to date has been widely criticized by both residents of Guildwood, and even non-residents affected by the proposed changes. The sheer lack of consideration for impact outside of the immediate development site is appalling and does not represent “good planning.” These types of developments are not created in a vacuum, and therefore their impacts and effects on the surrounding community and the current infrastructure deficits absolutely need to be weighed as part of any development proposal.

The planning justification report creates the false impression that there are many developments that are going ahead along the Kingston Road corridor near the Guildwood GO station. In fact, Toronto planning has approved certain projects but due to current housing market conditions, the developers are not proceeding.

1) Summary Position

- Right objective, wrong execution. While the Province’s TOC program aims to add housing, jobs, and amenities near transit, site-by-site outcomes are negotiated and

must be tailored to local conditions. At Guildwood, the scale and massing are disconnected from the immediate low-rise context and from Scarborough’s documented service constraints. If the project proceeds as is, there will be major constraints on parking supply for several years. The justification report by Fotenn implies that the area is well served by transit and lists the Eglinton East LRT as a connecting project, but this project has not received provincial funding even though it has been on the books for 19 years. Further, inadequate supporting transit limits the jobs, access to amenities, and effective use of housing [\[ontario.ca\]](#)

- Re-mass, phase to infrastructure, and secure benefits up front. We request a complete rethink of the project, including but not limited to: (a) step-down built form with mid-rise edges toward Payzac/Guildwood, (b) infrastructure-triggered phasing for health, schools, and transit, and (c) binding delivery of community amenities and affordable housing early in the build-out. [\[toronto.ca\]](#), [\[toronto.ca\]](#), [\[ontario.ca\]](#)

2) Built-Form Fit, Transition & Shadow

The draft massing places downtown-scale towers (up to 60 storeys/≈193 m) within close proximity of 1–2 storey homes, failing core tests in the City of Toronto Tall Building Design Guidelines—notably appropriate transition to lower-scale areas, maintenance of sunlight/sky view, and tower placement/separation—and Official Plan policies that require developments to “adequately limit” shadow impacts on adjacent Neighbourhoods (especially at equinox). [\[toronto.ca\]](#), [\[toronto.ca\]](#)

Request:

- Re-mass to step down to 8–12 storeys toward Payzac/Guildwood; locate taller elements closest to the rail corridor, with compliant tower separation and published City-reviewed sun/shadow studies before further advancement. [\[toronto.ca\]](#), [\[toronto.ca\]](#)

3) Scale vs. Planned Capacity (Growth, Not Over-concentration)

IO’s materials confirm ~2,500 units on the site; combined with active Kingston Road proposals (e.g., 4121 Kingston Rd), corridor growth risks front-loading decades of population against incomplete and unfunded infrastructure—contrary to the Official Plan’s principle of coordinating growth with services and facilities. [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#), [\[toronto.ca\]](#)

Request:



- Tie each phase to actual funded and approved infrastructure triggers (health, school, transit/service capacity, utilities) embedded in agreements and approvals, consistent with the OP's integration of land use and transportation/service planning. [\[toronto.ca\]](#)

4) Healthcare Access & Primary Care

Scarborough hospitals have publicly reported emergency departments operating around 200% of intended capacity, treating ~176,000+ ER visits per year, reflecting long-standing underinvestment. Province-wide, ~2.5 million Ontarians currently lack a family doctor, with warnings of further deterioration in access. Injecting thousands of new residents at Guildwood without a primary-care plan is not credible or responsible. [\[narcity.com\]](#), [\[ontariofam...sicians.ca\]](#)

Request:

- As a Phase 1 condition, secure on-site or immediately adjacent provincially run primary-care clinic shells and obtain Scarborough Health Network/Ministry of Health commitments that scale family-medicine capacity to population arrivals; publish a health services capacity memo before site plan approval. [\[cpha.ca\]](#)

5) School Capacity

Using TDSB planning yields (~0.10 students per unit), 2,500 units could generate ~250+ students from this site alone—more when adding Kingston Road projects—yet no accommodation strategy is provided. The TDSB's Education Development Charges background material illustrates the magnitude of system-wide student generation from new units and underscores the need for early planning. [\[vaughan.ca\]](#)

Request:

- Require TDSB/TCDSB letters of sufficiency and a student accommodation plan (catchments, transportation, potential new capacity) before each phase; where necessary, secure space or land contributions. [\[vaughan.ca\]](#)

6) Mobility, Parking & Construction Logistics

We recognize TOC goals to reduce car dependence, but Scarborough remains car-reliant, and Guildwood GO's commuter function cannot be compromised for years. IO lists a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) and other technical reports for Guildwood; these must be published so residents can see and properly evaluate/question modeled impacts on Kingston Rd. and local streets, and how mitigations will work. Often these studies are conducted by entities outside of the communities with little consideration for actual

nance of potential impact. Interim and final GO commuter parking solutions must be guaranteed—Mimico GO’s failed TOC (lost benefits and delays after partner collapse) is a cautionary precedent for over-promising without secured delivery. [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#), [\[cbc.ca\]](#)

Requests:

- During construction: Provide temporary structured parking or satellite lots with shuttle, safe PUDO operations, haul routes avoiding school zones, and clear signage. [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#)
- At completion: Commit to at bare minimum “no net loss” GO commuter parking, but given the scale of development, there should actually be additional GO Commuter parking provided, plus evidence-based residential parking (not a blanket 0.2 ratio) aligned with Scarborough travel behaviour. Publish the TIS and adopt TDM (transit pass programs, carshare, secure bike parking) and signal/turn measures on Kingston Rd. [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#)
- Active transportation barrier fix: Deliver the grade-separated pedestrian/cycling crossing over/under Kingston in early phases. [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#)

7) Affordable Housing & Social Infrastructure — Deliver Early

The TOC program states that benefits are “determined on a site-by-site basis”, including affordable housing and community amenities. Comparable TOC/Major Station projects demonstrate that on-site childcare, community spaces, green space, and moderated heights can and should be secured. At Danforth GO (Rushden Station), a later tower phase was scaled down (57→40 storeys) after City feedback, and childcare/preschool forms part of the program (note that this station is also served by TTC’s Line 2 subway); the Oakville GO TOC framework envisions daycare/community/green spaces and is being rigorously reviewed by the Town for comprehensive infrastructure alignment. The lack of inclusion of mandated affordable housing in this project is most unfortunate, given the fact that low-income households would be a major beneficiary of the transit-oriented community. [\[ontario.ca\]](#), [\[bklarchitecture.com\]](#), [\[fitzrovia.ca\]](#), [\[infrastruc...ontario.ca\]](#)

Requests:

- Affordable Housing: Secure at least 20% of units as affordable (with a family-friendly mix) for 50+ years, using transparent AMR targets and legal agreements. [\[ontario.ca\]](#)

- Community Facilities (Phase 1/2, not last):
 - Multi-use community centre integrated into the podium (bookable rooms, youth/seniors programming, gym space);
 - Relocate/expand Guildwood Library into the station-area podium;
 - Licensed childcare sized to the project (rooms built, operators lined up) opening with first residential occupancy;
 - Everyday-needs retail (grocery-anchored) with letters of intent prior to shoring. (*Precedent: Danforth GO childcare and Oakville GO's community/daycare concepts.*) [[fitzrovia.ca](#)], [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]

8) Heritage Views — Guild Park & Guild Inn

Guild Park & Gardens/Guild Inn have Ontario Heritage Act protections that explicitly include key views to and from the site and Scarborough Bluffs setting; any skyline change must demonstrate that there are no unacceptable impacts to these heritage attributes. We request a heritage view and skyline assessment and, if needed, massing and height refinements to protect these sightlines. [[heritagetrust.on.ca](#)]

9) Process & Transparency

IO's project page lists core technical documents (TIS, Sun/Shadow, Wind, Noise/Vibration, Rail Safety, Servicing) that underpin the concept. To restore trust, please publish these materials, and commit to a co-design engagement round with GVCA and adjacent neighbourhoods before the next submission. [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]

10) Requested Next Steps (Actionable)

1. Re-mass plan to deliver mid-rise edges and set-back towers that pass City Tall Building and OP tests for transition and shadow. [[toronto.ca](#)], [[toronto.ca](#)]
2. Phase to capacity: embed health, schools, and transit capacity triggers and publish supporting memos/analyses. [[cpha.ca](#)], [[vaughan.ca](#)], [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]
3. Early, bonded benefits: 20% affordable housing, community centre + library relocation, childcare, and grocery-anchored retail in early phases, with occupancy holds until delivered. [[ontario.ca](#)], [[fitzrovia.ca](#)], [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]

4. Commuter function: no-net-loss GO parking at completion and interim solutions during construction; publish the TIS and adopt a clear mitigation package for Kingston Rd. [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]
5. **Heritage:** complete a heritage view impact assessment for Guild Park/Guild Inn and adjust massing accordingly. [[heritagetrust.on.ca](#)]
6. **Engagement reset:** establish working groups where there are co-design sessions with GVCA and residents from affected streets prior to resubmission; publish all core technical reports now listed on IO's site. [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)]

Closing

Guildwood is ready to welcome new neighbours—but not at the expense of short-sighted policies, lack of basic services, neighbourhood livability, or heritage. The GVCA has been engaged in the TOC process, the LAC, as well as listening to numerous conversations, submissions and feedback from residents, businesses, special interest groups, and various community stakeholders. We are asking for a more well-thought out, right-sized, phased, and amenity-anchored plan that meets the Province's housing goals and the City's planning standards, while also reflecting Scarborough's realities. We look forward to working with IO, Metrolinx, the City of Toronto, and our elected representatives to achieve a more complete community enhancing proposal for development at Guildwood GO.

Sincerely,

Jeff Garrah

President, Guildwood Village Community Association (GVCA)
president@guildwood.ca

416-389-6369

Attachments (on request):

- Policy excerpts (City Tall Building Guidelines; Official Plan references) [[toronto.ca](#)], [[toronto.ca](#)]
- TOC precedent snapshots (Danforth GO, Oakville GO, Mimico GO lessons) [[fitzrovia.ca](#)], [[bklarchitecture.com](#)], [[infrastruc...ontario.ca](#)], [[cbc.ca](#)]