

Notes to assist those wishing to organise opposition to a CofA application

Petitions

Petitions are useful at the CofA to reflect that the neighbours are not in support and may suit those who are unable to write a letter.

Sometimes the developer/agent/architect for the applicant will try to get a petition to show there is support -- so to do one in opposition is also useful as a defensive tactic

I have attached an example that was used in a recent CofA case.

The neighbours on the street both sides and perhaps the ones behind if the house will extend out to the back

Try first for

5 houses to the left your side

5 houses to the right your side

5 houses to the left other side

5 houses to the right other side

Petition in Opposition to Proposed Demolition and Redevelopment of 9 MacNaughton Road North York Committee of Adjustment November 10, 2016

Our objection to the request for minor variances in this application relate directly to the tests set out in s. 45(1) of the *Planning Act*.

Based on our review of the application we are of the opinion that the requested variances do not satisfy the statutory tests.

- 1) The variances do not maintain the intent and purpose of the Official Plan, the policies of which are directed to ensuring that new development in a neighbourhood respects the existing physical character of that neighbourhood. The proposed dwelling is not within the physical parameters of other residential development comprising the character of the neighbourhood;
- 2) The variances do not respect the intent and purpose of either By-law 569-2013 or By-law No. 1916, as amended; wherein restrictions on setbacks, building and wall heights, floor space and integral garage provisions ensure that the massing of new development is appropriately scaled to other existing development.

In this case the proposal exceeds a size that is consistent with other homes on MacNaughton Road;

- 3) The variances are not minor: considerable adverse impact will result as a consequence of constructing the proposed dwelling;
- 4) The variances are not desirable for the appropriate development of the property.

The proposed development represents a significant intensification of the housing stock and facilitates a form of new residential development that is neither consistent with the prevailing character of the neighbourhood nor reinforces the stability of the Leaside Community.

Our conclusion is that the variances do not represent good planning and are not consistent with the public interest.

We ask that the Committee of Adjustment refuse all the variances applied for by the applicant.

Signed,