

November 10, 2009

Toronto and East York Community Council

**Re: 9 Prince Arthur Avenue –
Request for the City Solicitor and Planning staff to attend
the Ontario Municipal Board**

I am writing to request that the City Solicitor and Planning staff be instructed to attend the Ontario Municipal Board regarding 9 Prince Arthur Avenue in support of the Committee of Adjustment's decision to refuse the variance requested.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the City Solicitor together with Planning staff be instructed to attend the Ontario Municipal Board to support the decision of the Committee of Adjustment in application No. A1004/08TEY respecting 9 Prince Arthur Avenue, to refuse the variance.

SUMMARY:

An application for minor variance for 9 Prince Arthur Avenue was heard by the Committee of Adjustment on October 7, 2009. The proposal is to legalize and to maintain a front yard parking pad constructed without proper authorization.

The application for 9 Prince Arthur is opposed by the Annex Residents' Association as well as City of Toronto Planning and Heritage Staff.

The property at 9 Prince Arthur Avenue falls within the East Annex Heritage District, designated under part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. The guidelines outlined in the East Annex Heritage District Study, which aims to protect the valued characteristics of this neighbourhood, state that front yard parking should be avoided unless there are no other options for parking. In the case of 9 Prince Arthur Avenue, other means of parking do exist both on the street and at a nearby Green P parking lot. In addition, 9 Prince Arthur is within walking distance to the St. George Subway station.



In their report to the Committee of Adjustment, Planning and Heritage staff stated their belief that the character of the property will not be maintained if the parking pad is permitted, that the proposal is contrary to the intent and purpose of the City's Official Plan, that the proposed two space parking pad would erode and negatively impact the generous landscape character of this portion of the street and would negatively impact the appreciation of the heritage buildings. Staff stated there is ample parking available in the area. They recommended the Committee refuse the application, which the Committee did.

In addition, there is currently a ban on front yard parking in this area. This moratorium was put in place for good reason. Front yard parking often kills mature trees, if not directly through removal, then through soil compaction and loss of water as rain runs away from soil across pavement. New parking pads also remove public parking as curb cuts affect the number of parking spaces available on a street. Front yard parking also degrades the safety and quality of the pedestrian realm, adds to the heat island effect in dense urban areas and transforms the beauty and environmental benefits of a green lawn or garden and replaces it with steel, plastic and asphalt.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Adam Vaughan

