

Hello All,

Thanks for all the replies, several of which asked for more guidance. Mark Davidson from Laburnham Avenue worked up some questions you could address. I added #10 to link the comments to the 9 38th application. Send the comments to me initially. A note to say you can prepare comments by August 27 is all that is needed now.

Here are some potential questions that could help people draft a letter. People can answer as many as they like, in whatever order they like. These questions are merely meant to stimulate thought about LB.

1. How long have you lived in LB?
2. Why did you choose to live in this neighbourhood?
3. What do you feel is different about LB compared to other neighbourhoods in the city?
4. How would you describe LB in terms of its character, personality, feel, sense of place?
5. How would you describe the character of LB houses?
6. In what ways do you believe the character of the houses connects to the character, personality, feel, or sense of place of the neighbourhood?
7. What impact do you feel the new homes are having on the neighbourhood's character, personality, and so on?
8. What do you believe is possibly the long term effect of these new housing developments?
9. What impact will a decrease in mature trees have on the neighbourhood?
10. Do you support or oppose the split of 9 38th Street from the photo attached. Frontage reduced from 40 feet required to 25 feet, density increased from 0.35 required to 0.56. One large healthy tree destroyed and 2 others threatened.

More info below.

- Mark

Just a note on the importance of the TLAB early disclosure system.

Toronto Local Appeal Board are putting barriers in the way of the public participation in their appeal hearings.

Such limitations are contrary to the Provinces position and the City of Toronto Official Plan

In the Review of the Ontario Municipal board Background document it states:

"Public participation is a cornerstone of Ontario's land use planning system. It ensures that Ontarians can help shape the future of the communities."

At the end of the prose is an eloquent letter from Eugene Knapik who lives on 27th Street. 27th Street could be used as a project on how not to plan.

The good news is that Gillian Burton is the hearing officer for 9 38th hearing and she has the potential to understand the irrationality of the OMB decisions.

Note there are now two other Long Branch appeals coming up, 38 36th Street and 22 33rd Street.

Please feel free to comment or ask for clarification.

Best regards. David

On 19/07/2017 3:28 PM, David Godley wrote:

Hello All. Here is an "appeal" to you as individuals or groups - 42nd St, Garden Place, Villa Road, 38th Street(to be canvassed by residents), 37th Street, 36th Street, 35th Street, Long Branch Avenue, 33rd Street, 31st Street, Atherton, Elton Avenue, 27th St north, mid and south, Ramsgate, Meaford, 23rd St and North Long Branch, Laburnham, Ash. LBNA, LPCC. I have no contacts for Elton or Ramsgate. Any others?

### **Help Save Long Branch**

I am requesting that you to confirm to me that you are be prepared to send a written submission (costs nothing and can be emailed) to the Toronto Local Appeal Board TLAB on the 9 38th Street file (see attached) before 27 Aug.

This is the date which City Legal will ask TLAB to allow full participation by anyone affected.

Letters could be individual or signed by from several people in a group. Written submissions are specifically requested by TLAB but as usual do not carry as much weight as submissions in person.

This in line with the Province's Statement that public participation is a cornerstone of Ontario's land use planning system. It ensures that Ontarians can help shape the future of their communities.

The statement is reflected in Toronto's Official Plan. However Developers and the OMB have been shaping Long Branch. Quality of life has been reduced unnecessarily especially with loss of trees.

**9 38th is the first hearing going ahead under TLAB and is a test case. A favourable decision could well influence following hearings.**

When 4 James was approved by the OMB it lead to scores of severances and soldier houses.

Development Planners, the OMB and now COA illogically say if a soldier house development exists it can be repeated on other lots in the neighbourhood.

Your letter would would relate to your experience with your area. Physical and psychological impacts of specific developments and those nearby are appropriate, especially any loss of trees.

The email can be as long or short as you like and can be as emotional or scientific as you like.

The conduct of the OMB or Committee of Adjustment would not help but their decisions, lack of reasoning and impacts are key.

The more people who respond the more credibility City Legal are given. Also there is more chance of getting rid of the repressive "early disclosure" requirements altogether thus allowing full participation.

This will also help TLAB hearing officers with the full background which OMB people do not seem to have.

Bear in mind that your reply may become public record because it could eventually end up on TLAB's section of the application centre (AIC).

Google Toronto Applications Information Centre, TLAB box, Ward 6, Search and click on 9 38th, Learn More and supporting information.

I realise this is the best weather of the year but your help would be appreciated. Contact me for questions or clarification and email correspondence to me please.

Thanks. More information is below.

Yours truly, David Godley

PS If you know of anyone who has left the neighbourhood because of inappropriate development please let me know.

PPS Additional TLAB appeals have been made for 38 36th St and 22 33rd, Variances as of today.

## INFORMATION

We know Long Branch's character is deteriorating at a fast rate. The division into narrow lots , much higher densities than permitted, cookie cutter houses and the loss of trees are the main culprits.

The OMB have usually ignored

- 1) public concerns.
- 2) the Official Plan especially directing density away from neighbourhoods, urban design policies and allowing residents to shape their neighbourhood.

3) policies for increasing the tree canopy from 25 to 40% (important for 9 38th as 3 major trees could be affected).

4) the general intention of the zoning bylaw.

5) the definitions of minor.

They have mistakenly

1) given too much weight to Provincial policies which are already incorporated into the Official Plan.

2) given too much weight to development planners.

3) allowed the market to influence their judgment specifically mentioned in decision on 30 36th as inappropriate.

4) not allowed for precedent that would mean more copycat developments

5) interpreted appropriate and desirable to include the applicant's maximisation of profit, again not supposed to be a consideration.

Mayor Tory,

The tree canopy on Twenty Seventh Street has taken quite a beating over the past couple years.

- huge maple at #75 died after construction
- 6 mature spruces destroyed illegally at #2
- huge maple at #2 badly damaged by a city crew - it's now almost dead.
- now the trees at #39 have been destroyed because they're in the way

I doubt the destruction of the canopy on our street is close to being over.

It's time for the City to get serious about protecting the canopy. I propose a moratorium on the killing of ANY MORE TREES ON TWENTY SEVENTH STREET for any reason besides the health of a tree or safety. This street has taken plenty enough abuse. It's unacceptable to allow it to continue. I invite you to take a walk with me down Twenty Seventh from Lakeshore to my place at #15. You can have a cup of tea in my garden and look across the street to see just what has happened to the once spectacular tree life around here. In a row of 5 new homes crowding the lots across the street, you will see one almost dead maple and a spruce which has been scalped up to the 30 foot level and nothing else. The trees were in the way. When we moved here a decade ago, we parked and walked around and were struck by what we saw. I recall saying to my wife, it's Muskoka in the City. And it really was one of Toronto's remarkable character

communities. Listening to some of the development planners I've heard Consent hearings, you would never know that.

If we're going to have an Urban Forestry Department responsible for protecting the canopy, give them some teeth and the resources to seriously do the job. Looking at what has happened to South Long Branch over the past couple years, it seems the developers have been given free reign to slice and dice our neighbourhood and mine it for all the profit possible with little regard for the character of this community. The system we have had in place to deal with variances worked fine when the neighbourhood was stable and all they heard were requests to extend a deck 6 inches or make a shed a shade bigger than allowed. Now that there is a development gold rush, that system has failed the City and failed my community. I have been to numerous Committee and OMB hearings and have heard development planners argue that major is minor, and that the devastation of the character of this neighbourhood is something normal or reasonable. It sure looks like the watchword has been "developers come first at all costs".

There is no doubt some redevelopment is reasonable and positive in our community. It really can be done with respect for the community. Case in point is the rebuild at 9 Twenty Seventh, just to the south of our home. That builder managed to save a huge silver maple, one of the biggest trees in the area - and a mature spruce in the front yard and still build a large home. They even sent a crew to fertilize the roots of the trees on our property near the property line to mitigate root damage. And, they built a large but beautiful home which fits in very well with the existing homes along the street. This is a model for positive renewal. The builder made a very reasonable profit for his efforts and did it without the wholesale slice, dice and devastate approach we have seen over and over again in Long Branch.

Come down for a look. I'll be happy to show you the good the bad and the ugly.

Sincerely,

Eugene Knapik