374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive – Application to Remove Private Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>January 25, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Scarborough Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Jason Doyle, Acting Director, Urban Forestry, Parks, Forestry and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards:</td>
<td>Ward 44 – Scarborough East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number:</td>
<td>P:\2011\Cluster A\PFR\SC04-021611-AFS#12935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

The report requests that City Council approve a request for the removal of seven (7) privately-owned trees, based on their conflict with construction of two new houses proposed for 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive.

A consent application was approved by Committee of Adjustment, and building permits were issued in January 2010.

The trees in question are a 51 cm diameter Norway spruce (Picea abies) in fair condition, a 34 cm and a 47 cm diameter Scots pines (Pinus sylvestris) in fair condition, a 33 cm, a 36 cm and a 37cm diameter birch trees (Betula sp.) in fair to good condition, and a 114 cm diameter silver maple (Acer saccharinum) in fair condition. The applicant has requested permission to remove these trees due to conflict with the proposed construction.

None of the subject trees are considered significant by Urban Forestry. The silver maple tree is now misshapen as a result of repeated pruning to clear existing overhead hydro wires on the road allowance fronting the property.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation recommends that:
1. City Council approve removal of seven (7) privately-owned trees located, at 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive, based on their conflict with construction of two houses.

Financial Impact

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

COMMENTS

An application for a permit has been received on behalf of the property owners of 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive to remove seven (7) private trees. The application has been made to allow for construction of two new homes. The lands formerly contained one single family dwelling and a detached garage, both of which have been demolished.

Upon receipt of an application for consent to sever the lands into two separate lots, Urban Forestry inspected the site. A memo was sent to Committee of Adjustment advising that Urban Forestry did not support the consent application due to the presence of existing healthy trees. In December 2009, the consent application and two minor variance applications were approved by Committee of Adjustment. A Certificate of Consent was issued March 10, 2010. Approval of these applications was to allow for the construction of two new houses. Toronto Building issued the building permits in January 2010.

Four of the trees are in fair condition and three are in fair to good condition. All seven trees need to be removed in order to build the two houses, and to accommodate driveways and installation of the necessary utilities to service the houses. It is not possible to retain the trees and construct the houses.

There are seven (7) other privately-owned trees on the properties that are to be retained and protected, three (3) of which are protected under the Private Tree By-law. A satisfactory tree preservation plan has been received for these trees.

The arborist report indicates that five large maturing trees are proposed for replanting on the site. There is insufficient room to accommodate all replacement trees on site.

As required under Section 813-17, of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 813, Trees, Article III, a 'Public Notice' sign was posted on the subject property for the minimum 14 day posting period. The posting serves to notify the community of the applicant's intention to remove the tree and provide an opportunity for objection to the application. In response to the Notice of Application, 17 letters were received, as well as a petition containing an additional 40 names, all objecting to removal of the trees in question.

Should the request for a permit to remove the privately-owned trees be approved, approval must be conditional on the owner agreeing to plant five large growing native shade trees. Since there is insufficient room to accommodate all replacement trees on site, the applicant submitted cash-in-lieu for the planting of 16 trees. Payment was also
received for the planting of one street tree, which was required as a condition of approval of the consent application. Payment in the amount of $9,911.00 will fund the planting of 17 large maturing trees in the community.

The intent of the Private Tree By-law is to preserve significant trees on private property where possible, and to ensure a sustainable urban forest in the City. It is not meant to stop development, but to try and use a balanced approach when planning construction. In this instance, it is not possible to protect and retain the seven trees noted above, if two new houses are to be constructed. The replanting plan and cash-in-lieu provided are satisfactory, and I am, therefore, recommending that the permit for tree removal be approved subject to conditions.

CONTACT
Michael McClellan, Supervisor, Tree Protection and Plan Review, Scarborough District, Tel: 416-396-5131, Fax: 416 396-4248 E-mail: mmcclel@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

______________________________
Jason Doyle
Acting Director, Urban Forestry
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Attachment 1

Tree No. 2N
51 cm diameter Norway spruce, fair condition

Tree No. 3N
114 cm diameter silver maple, fair condition
Tree Nos. 3E, 2E and 1E
28 cm, 47 cm and 34 cm diameter Scot pines in fair condition

Tree Nos. 1S, 3S, and 7S
30 cm, 37 cm and 36 cm diameter white birch, fair to good condition
Trees proposed for removal

Trees to be protected
Attachment 4

Staff report for action on the removal of private trees at 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive
October 12, 2010

Attn: Chris Turner

We, the neighbours living in the Beechgrove Drive, West Hill area, object to having the 7 trees removed/cut down (basically clearcutting) on the properties of 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive.

Why are there by-laws in effect to protect trees and well-established neighbourhoods?? It appears that these by-laws are constantly being ignored, and neighbourhoods are continuously having to be vigilant and protest to save trees that are supposedly under protection!

This petition contained 40 additional signatures of area residents.
From: Tracey & Bob <tracey_bung@yahoo.ca>
To: <tporeast@toronto.ca>, <councillor_moeser@toronto.ca>
Date: 13/10/2010 6:50 pm
Subject: 376 Beechgrove Dr.

The application to remove the trees will not be a problem for the new owner, what the problem is the variance to split the lot into two lots is already been done.

Face it, you were asleep at the switch to allow this in the first place. Its a tax grab by the city, two houses to tax with very little cost to the city, infill building is going on everywhere, who cares if there is no place to put the snow in the winter or green garbage containers in the summer. They are altered if you can find room right outside the front door all summer long, what a stench, you only need to live a couple of years in these places to realise their shortcomings.

But the taxes they bring in woot woot.

Quality of life takes second place and as for the green building of these places high density, its pavement and cement front and back and absorb heat all day long so the Air conditioners must be used to keep these places livable. Windows must be kept shut due to the dust and noise.

This city is all about getting more tax dollars from wherever it can no matter what the cost. Ifs, spend, spend, spend to what ever the council decides in the Arsy farty crowd who only spend tax payers money never spend or earn their own end expect to be paid via grants.

Well welcome Rob Ford

There will be a breath of fresh air all over this city.

Robert McBean
owner
309 Beechgrove Dr.
From: suzannah rye <suzannahis@gmail.com>
To: <tpbreast@toronto.ca>
CC: <councillor_mooser@toronto.ca>
Date: 13/10/2010 2:24 pm
Subject: Regards the removal of 7 trees from 374/376 Beechgrove Drive

Urban Forestry
70 Nashdene Road
Toronto

Dear Mr Turner,

Once again I seat in front of my computer trying to compose yet another letter, to try and save trees in our neighbourhood that I believed were under an existing by-law protection. I find that I am starting to give up the fight, as no sooner does one sign come down and trees are cleared away, and another one pops up on yet another property, asking for anyone objecting to write and voice their concerns.

I have many times, along with other concerned neighbours, who watch like myself, aghast at how easily by-laws are side stepped and changed, no matter if we have written in or not. It seems that if a certain mass of people do not join forces and complain, the others who have, are ignored. I am trying to understand just how many people do need to protest to actually be taken seriously - 50, 100, 1000? And if this is the case, which I fear it is, why bother putting in by-laws that will not be adhered to anyway to accommodate the new land owners, which the majority of time is a builder, that moves in, causes havoc with the land, and then leaves us to live with his devastation of our area.

How is this possible with all the protective by-laws supposedly in place, everyone on our streets are constantly wondering. If these were by-laws voted in, how is it possible to keep changing them?

But I am sorry, I know this is not really anything you want to read, as your only concern, and rightly so, is whether or not 7 trees will get the death sentence pronounced on them. I am still in shock over the quantity of trees that are being requested to be removed... 7! How is this possible to even consider removing all the mature trees, because otherwise, the 2 new houses they want to build will not fit on the land. Is it only me that finds the request mind boggling? I moved into this unique area of West Hill almost 37 years ago because of the forested rural look it had. We fought against sidewalks, curbs, which our politicians thought we needed, and builders trying to buy up the large lots, so they could put new larger homes on them. Some we fought, as they would have played havoc with the trees but others who compromised with us and took our concerns seriously were welcomed. We now have a nice blend of homes in the surrounding streets.

Yet now, it seems that all the letters, all our protests to preserve our nook of "green" is falling on deaf ears. And I just can't find the answers any more as to why. Why is this being allowed to happen? Yes, they got to sub-divide the lot and will be allowed to build 2 houses on it,
but at what cost? Did the councillors who backed this division even take the time to evaluate how it would impact the existing mature trees on this land? Is this even taken into consideration? Is an employee from urban forests or the tree protection department from the city ever sent out to see these properties and access them? To see if established mature trees will be affected?

Personally, I fear that other than how much more taxes they will be getting in with the extra houses, is about all that our councillors are concerned with. I am still hoping that our forestry agency is standing behind the best interests of the trees, although my confidence is starting to be shaken, as I see no matter how we send in our protests and objections, more and more permits are issued for approval of multi tree removals.

Yes, we have by-laws, but what good are they really when they can be manipulated to fit the agenda of the day?

So even as I write this, I am deeply saddened with the knowledge that our fight for these trees will be in vain, as I am sure the houses will win over the lives of these trees.

Which is so disheartening as those trees really cannot speak up and fight for themselves, and we will again hear the chain saws as they are downed because of the greed society seems to live in nowadays.

Again I apologize for this long winded letter, but hopefully, you will take a moment and see just how many in our neighbourhood do really care about preserving the nature that surrounds us. And hope that the neighbours who have given up because “no matter if we sign this petition or not, they are just going to ignore it anyway, so what’s the use?”

It was a bitter blow to hear so many people express these feelings. How truly sad that they have given up on the people we are supposed to trust to uphold the laws that are in place.

Please consider everything before condemning these trees. I really want to believe that your department is there to protect the best interests of the trees and not the builders.

Sincerely,

Suzannah Rygula

—

"Life is not measured by the breaths we take, but by the moments that take our breath away."
Yet again I find myself, along with concerned neighbours trying to save 7 trees this time. In the last month we have watched as two new property owners have asked for and been allowed to cut multiple trees from their properties, as otherwise they cannot build their new houses on them.

My question is and will always be the same - how is this being allowed? This area is still unique with its country style setting which is fast starting to become a memory.

When people buy and consider building new, why is it that the existing by-laws are so easily changed to accommodate? Were they not put into law to actually prevent the 'make a quick buck' and move on investors/builders?

So why is it, it seems, that they are set aside and new lot sizes approved, totally out of sync with the rest of the neighborhood?

Why is it that mature trees are allowed to be cut down? Approval being given by the very departments that were established to safeguard these trees?

How completely devastating to come to the realization that maybe it really is true, that the almighty buck rules nowadays when variances are given.

But then again, unfortunately, trees do not pay property taxes, so their well being seems to not be too high on the agenda when taking everything into consideration.

Please, as a section of the urban forestry, that is there to help keep our environment on track, please reconsider NOT ALLOWING more trees to be destroyed to accommodate the 2 houses that they want to build at the expense of these trees, when 1 house would suffice.

Please help keep West Hill green!

Yours,

Horst Rygula

Horst

10/13/2010
From: willow rye <willow_rye@yahoo.ca>
To: <tppreach@toronto.ca>
Date: 11/10/2010 7:00 pm
Subject: OBJECTION to the removal of trees on 374 / 376 Beechgrove Drive

Willow Rygula
299 Beechgrove Drive
West Hill, ON
M1E 4A2

October 11, 2010

Mr. Chris Turner
Urban Forestry
70 Nashidene Road
Toronto, ON
M1V 2V2

Dear Mr. Turner,

I am writing in regards to the notification of the removal of 7 trees located at 374 / 376 Beechgrove Drive in West Hill (Toronto). I am still in shock not only over the fact that this property was allowed to be subdivided into 2 small lots, which do not even comply with current zoning by-laws (I never saw a notification advising that this was being taken under consideration and I drive by this property daily!), but also over the quantity of trees that are now being requested to be removed...7?! The property is then devoid of all the mature trees. How can this even be taken into consideration?

I am submitting my OBJECTION to the removal of these trees.

The beauty of the West Hill area is the number of trees that exist and grow here. For a city that is striving to be "kept" green and a community that is known for its beautiful treed lots, when does the protection of the removal of such trees come into play? Why do we have laws in place to protect these trees, when they are so quickly being cut down? I, and my neighbours, feel as though we are constantly writing to stop this from happening, which we shouldn't even have to be doing if these laws were actually properly enforced.

So am I (are we) to understand, that any tree no matter how old or healthy it is, can be so simply removed at the whim of the newest occupants, who bought the property with the trees in existence? This has to be stopped and the West Hill community (and others experiencing this same trend) has to be saved from this constant desire to destroy what the residents love about the area. There are not many areas like this left in Toronto; why must they all be destroyed?!

Hopefully the right choice is made at this point. So, again, I firmly object to the removal of these trees.

Sincerely,

Willow Rygula
Marlene Plourde  
23 Atkinson Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario  
M1E 4B6

October 13, 2010

Mr. Chris Turner  
Urban Forestry  
70 Nashdene Road  
Toronto, Ontario

Dear Mr. Turner:

I am writing in regards to your notification of the removal of 7 trees from the property at 374/376 Beechgrove Drive, West Hill, ON. Are you kidding me? You are actually clear cutting the property of all trees!! Where is the by-law that supposedly protects mature trees from exactly this situation? Namely a builder getting his hands on a piece of property and clearing away all trees to be able to SQUEEZE 2 houses onto a lot that rightly should only support 1 house. So, to enable these two houses to be built “all” the trees have to be removed? May I also ask what Urban Forestry is all about then if you are even considering allowing this to happen?

Why do we have these laws in place that supposedly protect trees in neighbourhoods and yet it seems as if every few months I’m having to write another letter to save yet another tree or group of trees in our area? I wish to make my feelings perfectly clear to you and everyone at Urban Forestry - I ABSOLUTELY, POSITIVELY OBJECT to the removal of all these trees!

We need to stop the annihilation of our forested neighbourhoods. Our wonderful trees are what makes West Hill so unique and I urge, beg and implore you to deny this request to clear cutting the property and help maintain our coveted landscape.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not allow this to happen yet again.

Sincerely,

Marlene Plourde

c.c. Ron Moeser
TO: CHRIS TURNER
FAX: 416-396-4248

--- Forwarded message ---

From: Charles Stelcer <cestelcer@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 13, 2010 at 10:56 AM
Subject: The removal of 7 trees at 374-376 Beechgrove Drive
To: tpmurst@toronto.ca

People move into the West Hill area for the semi-rural setting it offers with its mature trees and established gardens. We all would like to maintain this unique community and it sure isn't helping when variances are allowed to builders that will totally devastate a property, leaving eyesores houses on too small lots, while they get to move on and we get to live with the mess they leave behind—in this instance, the disregard of set by-laws concerning lot sizes, means that not only would both lots be substandard but that neither could be utilized without the destruction of ALL the trees on the property. How could this even be considered?

On top of that there will be no possibility of the sacrificed trees being replaced as required, as the lots are too small to accommodate replanting of replacement trees.

Would that alone not be an indication, that if not all, but at least the majority of the 7 mature trees should be left?

The vast majority of the neighbours in the area were not made aware of the lot severance and, had we been, would have opposed it vigorously. We had no chance to even consider the issue as we were not even made aware of it.

So now the only chance we have of trying to save these mature trees, is to yet again petition the very branch of the government that was formed, to supposedly be there to protect our environment, mainly our trees, which fall, it seems, at the whim of the new property owners.

Surely this cannot be right, can it?

10/13/2010

Sincerely,

CHARLES STELCER
From: Gary Baldey <gbaldey@sympatico.ca>
To: <tppreast@toronto.ca>
Date: 12/10/2010 8:41 pm
Subject: 374/376 Beechgrove Drive

Attention Mr. Chris Turner:

We are submitting to you our strong opposition to the Tree Damage Application for the destruction of 7 healthy trees at 374/376 Beechgrove Drive.

This application is in clear violation of the Toronto City ByLaw requiring a 3:1 replacement ratio.

Due to the unfortunate subdivide of this property, which was also strongly objected to by the community, the property is now too small to accommodate the ByLaw requirement. The present property owners have no vested interest in the preservation of the streets unique green character or how these unwelcome new homes will affect property values for the numerous long-term residents who have lawfully maintained their investments. With this Damage Application we do not want to set a precedent for future speculation development by unscrupulous developers only wishing to turn a profit and move on.

We are expecting Urban Forestry and Ward 44 Councillor Ron Moeser to respect the serious concerns of the residents and turn-down any approval of this Damage Application.

Respectfully,
Gary and Donna Baldey
330 Beechgrove Drive
West Hill, Ontario
M1E 4A2
From: Ruth Joyce <ruthjoyce@sympatico.ca>
To: <bprrast@bronto.ca>, <councillor_moeser@toronto.ca>
Date: 07/10/2010 4:14 pm
Subject: Attn: Mr. Chris Turner (Beechgrove Tree destruction)

Having been a resident of 330, Beechgrove Drive for 45 years I have observed several changes but NONE as damaging the one I am now aware of regarding the property at 374/376 Beechgrove Drive. The blatant disregard for the unique and charming character of the street which has drawn the current residents to this area the proposed destruction of 7 mature trees is totally unacceptable.

Further...I cannot understand why planning permission was granted for the lots now on this property which, in my opinion, shows that the developer is just out for as much profit as he can make.

Part of the blame for this situation lies clearly with the councillor and the Planning Department.

This is a unique street and should remain so. It is NOT a high density subdivision.

I am willing to attend any meeting where this proposal will be presented to strongly voice my opposition.

Ruth Joyce
330 Beechgrove Drive
Scarborough M1E 4A4
The Falsita family <falsita@rogers.com>
To: <tppreast@toronto.ca>
Date: 07/10/2010 0:18 pm
Subject: Tree removal 374/376 Beechgrove Drive

Dear Mr. Turner,

An Application has been submitted to destroy 7 healthy trees on lots 374 and 376 Beechgrove Drive. As a property owner on this street I strongly object to cutting down healthy trees to erect two houses. I chose to buy a house on this beautiful street because of the trees. Please STOP this application from being approved. Save our trees.

Thank You
Sincerely,

Angela Falsita
317 Beechgrove Drive.
From: Irene and Brent Jesperson <bjesperson@rogers.com>
To: <ppreast@toronto.ca>
Date: 07/10/2010 7:04 pm
Subject: Attn Chris Turner re 374/376 Beechgrove Dr

Dear Chris

I have a concern re the cutting down of 7 healthy trees at the above address. I think the property is too small for 2 houses let alone 2 houses with no trees on the property. Beechgrove Dr has a unique flavour with its treed lots and cottage feeling which raises our property values and our quality of living. I am opposed to a variance that would allow the cutting of these trees with no replacement as it seems they are not going to be held to the 'cut 1 plant 3 rule'.

Thank you for your time,

Dr Brent Jesperson
359 Beechgrove Dr
From: "Jacqueline L Lacy" <jacqueline.l.lacy@aexp.com>
To: <tppreast@toronto.ca>
CC: <councillor_moesser@toronto.ca>
Date: 08/10/2010 12:30 pm
Subject: 374/376 Beechgrove Dr

Attn: Chris Turner

Understand an application has been made to destroy 7 healthy trees on this property as it is interfering with the ability to build 2 small homes. This needs to be stopped and builders should not be allowed to destroy trees. This is a ravine street and without our mature trees we will lose what we have.

So please put a stop to this and Save Our Trees.

Thanks
Jackie & Peter Lacy
315 Beechgrove Dr
Toronto, ON M1E 4A2.

Jackie Lacy
Account Executive, Client Management

By American Express Business Travel
Tel: 866-439-3436
Check out your worldwide travel community at www.businesstravelconneXion.com
October 12, 2010

Urban Forestry
70 Nashdene Road
Toronto, ON M1V 2V2
Attention: Mr Chris Turner

Councillor Ron Moeser
Constituency Office
5504 Lawrence Ave. East
Toronto, ON M1C 3R2

Re: 374/376 Beechgrove Drive

This is a letter I felt compelled to write. In December 2009, I canvassed my
neighbourhood to hopefully put a stop to the severing of the lot at 376 Beechgrove Drive.
To my and my neighbour’s dismay, city council granted this regrettable request.

That fact that an original allowance (prior to December 2009) had been granted to sever
the lot should not have mattered. The time had expired for the property owners and the
ruling should have been new, otherwise every one present, including me, wasted their
time and taxpayers money that day (December 2nd).

Just quietly observing how the property owners have conducted the property maintenance
and dwelling removal since the second ruling in December 2009, speaks to the lack of
respect they have for the residents of this unique neighbourhood. Living just three houses
away, we have had to witness the overgrown yard for months (until the city came in to
take care of it). We kept quiet and did not complain about this lack of regular
maintenance. Then the removal of the previous property at 376 Beechgrove was done in a
manner that was not respectful of the neighbourhood. It was done in such a way that I
fear for anyone to get close to the lot. The lot was not properly secured and each time I
passed the property, I was reminded of the shoddy workmanship. The hole that the
dwelling left was not safe and the old foundation was left lying around for weeks — and,
considering there are many young children and small animals present in the
neighbourhood, I feared something terrible might happen.

Now to top off my concerns, I received a letter alerting me to the next issue — the taking
down of the very trees that make this neighbourhood unique. Replacing them is just a
band-aid solution to the fact that the severing of the lot should not have been allowed in
the first place. Residents who pay their taxes and actually live in the neighbourhood
should have been heard. To allow a speculator to come in and change the landscape is
disgusting. I obtained 3 pages of names that were opposed to this and I presented them in
person to council on December 2nd, 2009 and faxed them to Councillor Ron Moeser on
the evening of December 1st, 2009. (I have saved a copy of the original signatures if
needed.)
I do not feel that there should be any compromise in this situation. When the property owners first applied for this variance, was there not a thorough geological land survey submitted? One in which the trees are recorded and then it could have been projected that two new dwellings would impact the environment in this way. Is this not a requirement in a case like this?

One dwelling was on the property and only one should be replaced. The senseless cutting down of trees needs to be stopped. This is a substantial hit to the neighbourhood and the environment. The richness of the mix of deciduous and coniferous trees is beautiful. The Birch, Scotch Pine, Norway Spruce and Silver Maple trees that are going to be destroyed are just one example of what is found on the properties in and around Beechgrove Drive. We need to preserve this natural part of the area.

Given this past holiday weekend, I only wish I could have had time to canvass the neighbourhood once again. I only hope that my neighbours have had a chance to come forward to express their concerns about this senseless decision.

Please contact me about any decisions regarding this matter or if any other information is needed.

Sincerely,

Tom Gurney
368 Beechgrove Drive
Toronto, ON
M1E 4A5
416-281-3971
tcjgurney@rogers.com
URBAN FORESTRY
ATTN: CHRISTNER
FAX: 416-396-1248

OCTOBER 12, 2001

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT I, THE UNDERSIGNED OBJECT TO THE REMOVAL OF ANY TREES FROM THE PROPERTY AT 374 & 375 BEECHGROVE DRIVE AND THE SUBDIVISION OF THIS PROPERTY IN THE FIRST PLACE. AS THE OWNER OF 349 BEECHGROVE DRIVE SINCE APRIL 1950, IT MATTERS GREATLY TO ME THAT WHAT HAPPENS NOT ONLY ON THIS STREET BUT TO THE WHOLE AREA. WE HAVE WORKED VERY HARD TO KEEP THIS AREA IN ITS NATURAL STATE.

YOURS TRULY

Mary L. McCracken
(Mrs.) MARY L. McCracken
October 08, 2010

Urban Forestry
70 Nashdene Road
Toronto, ON
M1V 2V2

ATTN: Mr. Chris Turner

CC: Mr. Ron Moeser, Councillor Ward 44

Dear Sir:

We strongly object to the Application to remove 7 healthy trees from #374/376 Beechgrove Drive in West Hill for the reason of building 2 new and reportedly oversized houses.

The property having been sub-divided into 2 small lots already is out of character with the rest of the properties on this once unique and lovely street, but removing all the older growth trees just makes is more so.

Surely it must say something about the house and property ratios when there will not be room on the new lots to replace ANY of the trees, let alone the 3-1 ratio in the by-laws.

Please help preserve the attractiveness and uniqueness of this lovely street by NOT ALLOWING these trees to be cut down. Force the developers for once to build houses to suit the sites as they are, not the reverse.

Yours truly
Lowell & Judy Hoar
301 Beechgrove Drive
West Hill, ON
M1E 4A2

\[Signature\]
From: "Allan Brown <abrown@saepower.com>
To: <councillor_moeser@toronto.ca>
CC: <tpgray@toronto.ca>
Date: 13/10/2010 12:14 pm
Subject: Trees at 374/376 Beechgrove Drive

Dear Councillor Moeser and Mr. Turner,

When I bought my house on Beechgrove a number of years ago, I contacted both the sitting Councillor and the zoning department of the then City of Scarborough who both assured me that this area was protected and zoned to prevent division of the existing lots and the building of high-density housing. The charm of the area is its spacious, urban forest feel, and I suspect one of the main reasons many residents bought properties there, including me. All of the people I know on the street are lovers of trees and gardens; we cherish our deer, fox, rabbits and other creatures that share our forest. Further, this is an important buffer area that retains and slows rainwater runoff to reduce erosion of the unstable banks of the Highland Creek Ravine. A substantial part of that comes from the undisturbed leaves and pine needles carpeting the forest floor and undeveloped areas around the large trees. It should be protected for that reason alone! A replacement small stick tree stuck in grass is not as effective. We only have so many mature trees that hold the soil, reseed the forest and cleanse our air. Carving up or removing these forested areas to stick in more homes destroys this major beneficial effect, not to mention the beauty of the area we love.

It is a travesty that this protective zoning designed to shield the area was breached to permit a speculator to make a fast profit at the expense of the other residents. By observing their methods of demolition and removal of debris it is clear that this "developer" operates at the edge of or beyond safety, workmen’s comp and tree protection laws. This appears to be a highly unprofessional, corner-cutting, small outfit. Why is the City allowing them these profitable exceptions when they apparently flout all codes and regulations? Were you aware that they hauled away the demolition debris in small loads in a rusty van, loaded by hand by a few (probably underpaid, and obviously unprofessional) labourers with no safety gear after normal hours to avoid inspectors? I wouldn’t be surprised to hear that they dumped the debris illegally somewhere - that’s how the tenor of the removal appeared. No proper dumpster. No heavy equipment. No supervision. No safety gear, goggles, etc. It looked like a third-world operation! Have you investigated if they obtained a proper dumping permit or paid dumping charges? Was there a safety inspector present for the demolition? It also appeared very amateurish and unsafe.

I respectfully request that the variance be withdrawn if they can’t retain the trees, or if that is not possible, that their application to remove the trees be rejected. They have not demonstrated any respect for the wishes of the other residents or respect for laws and regulations. They should not receive any special treatment. Why not build a good, single residence there? That should still return a reasonable profit, especially considering the cheap (likely illegal) methods they have used to date.
We, the residents and investors in this unique area, want to ensure that no precedent is set that would allow a stampede of similar fast-buck destroyers-of-neighborhoods to come in. We love and respect our tree canopy, animals, and the adequate spacing among homes to retain some forest. I thought it was the City's stated policy to increase this canopy, not destroy it for the profit of a few. The assurances I received years ago should mean something, and not be put aside so capriciously!

Thank you for your kind consideration on this matter,

Best regards,

Allan Brown

343 Beechgrove Drive

416-724-1416 (h)

416-296-0560 x226 (w)
From: Brígita Zile <zileb@smh.ca>  
To: <councillor._moesar@toronto.ca>, <bpreast@toronto.ca>  
Date: 18/10/2010 4:39 pm  
Subject: removal of trees at 376 Beechgrove Drive (Attn: Chris Turner)

Dear Mr. Moesar,

This email is in response to your letter dated October 12, 2010 to the Beechgrove Drive residents regarding the above mentioned property. You have stated that you oppose "any removal" of the mature trees on this property and will work with the residents on Beechgrove to assure that the green character of the area is retained. My husband and I live at 297 Beechgrove Drive. We purchased our home in 2001 and have lived in the West Hill area our entire lives.

As life long residents of this area, we can certainly appreciate the landscape. The mature trees, conservation area and lake offer a "rural type" setting in the city. We also support reasonable growth in our area and welcome new families. In the case of 376 Beechgrove Drive, the trees in question consist of 3 small birch trees, a very small scot pine and from what we can see, a large mature maple along with a medium sized spruce tree.

Beechgrove is a long street with an abundance of large mature trees (as are the other streets in this area) and frankly, I don’t see how removing (for the most part smaller trees) from one property will have a dramatic impact on the “green” character of the area. I trust that Urban Forestry intend to work with the property owner and in accordance with the existing by-law to reach a reasonable compromise (ie: building design to perhaps keep some of the trees and/or replant once the homes are built). I am also confident that Urban Forestry’s mandate is to review the over all impact of this application to the area at large. I don’t think we will see a case of “clear cutting” on numerous lots to accommodate a number of new homes.

You letter does not offer any alternatives for the property owner. Are we to assume that you would prefer this lot remain unoccupied? I would prefer to see a new home built (or two as the owner intends) which would add to the value of other homes on our street, and allow new families to enjoy this area. The original house on this property had sat vacant and neglected for several years. This is not the vision I have for our area.

I will also comment on the fact that our immediate neighbours “clear cut” several mature trees on our property line (just before we purchased our home) to facilitate their pre-fab home to be craned onto their property. Our other neighbours excavated within a few feet of their 150 year Cank tree to accommodate a front porch and garage which has severely comprised the tree. These two examples obviously occurred before the tree by-law existed. This is significant because these are the same residents that now “oppose” other trees from coming down.

In closing, my husband and I do NOT support your efforts here and by way of this, would like our position formally considered. We believe our area offers the opportunity for new homes to be built without a significant impact to the surrounding “green character”. The current by-law is in place to observe this and we trust that Urban Forestry will work with the property owner to reach a reasonable compromise.

Thank you.

Brígita Zile & Kevin Miller

Brígita Zile RN, CCRP  
Study Coordinator, Cardiology  
St. Michael’s Hospital  
229 Yonge St. RM: 4-012