

June 12, 2019

Public Appointments Secretariat
City Clerk's Office 12th floor, West Tower,
City Hall 100 Queen Street West Toronto,
ON M5H 2N2

Attention: Catherine Regan

**Re: Nominating Committee - Committee of Adjustment Selection of Candidates –
Etobicoke York Panel**

Dear Members of the Nominating Panel for the Committee of Adjustment;

In response to the letter of the Long Branch Neighbourhood Association (LBNA) dated May 23, 2019, please find an alternative perspective on the state of COA adjudication and the selection of new members as it relates to Long Branch and the Etobicoke York COA panel.

As a spokesperson for Vibrant Long Branch, I represent many area residents and property owners who are concerned about the need for objective planning decisions to be made by the Etobicoke York COA. **In our opinion, far too many consent and minor variance applications have been denied by the current panel.**

The LBNA does not speak for all Long Branch property owners and unequivocally does not represent the views of Vibrant Long Branch or its supporters.

We encourage you to select candidates that will make decisions that will repudiate the Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) dogma espoused by LBNA and other similar groups.

We encourage you to select candidates that will make decisions that acknowledge that the Zoning Bylaw parameters governing our neighbourhood were first enacted in 1964, are completely out of date and need to be updated to reflect the economic realities, the missing middle housing shortage and the usability standards required by contemporary families.

We encourage you to select candidates that will make decisions that focus on a future that will enhance, revitalize and result in a Vibrant Long Branch. Not stifle and anchor it to the legacy properties of a long gone era as LBNA insists.

The Long Branch Neighbourhood Association and its members are on a campaign to badger, intimidate and bully COA and TLAB applicants, area property owners, City Planning personnel, the Etobicoke York COA panel and now, all of you, as the Nominating Panel. Their prescriptive letter is clearly a political document attempting to hijack the selection process.

I'd suggest that you interview the current EY COA panel members to get a sense of the disrespect that they have been receiving from the LBNA and its members.

On numerous occasions they have accused current panel members of bias and incompetence (including their May 23rd letter to you), and in at least one case, they insinuated corruption. One of their members attempted to subpoena (denied by TLAB) the Panel Chair and other members to a TLAB hearing to explain why they approved a consent and minor variance application.

Their purpose is clearly not objectivity. Their letter and TLAB actions are evidence of the desire for complete control of the selection process, the new COA panel, the TLAB process and the Long Branch neighbourhood.

They seek to deny individual applicants their right to decide what's best for their properties and their families based on individual needs, wants and choices within reasonable, updated, forward looking regulation.

In 2016, the Ontario Association of Architects sent a letter to City Council outlining their suggestions on how best to reduce COA and TLAB appeals. In part it reads:

"The City of Toronto (and many municipalities) should first focus on partnering with stakeholders to address the root cause of this issue—an outdated and inefficient planning process—instead of its byproducts: COA appeals. This would achieve a far more desirable outcome for everyone involved".

"As we have repeatedly recommended to the City, including in our opposition and OMB appeal over Zoning Bylaw 569-2013, the City needs to take action to reduce the number of variances required by updating its planning documents and changing the as-of-right envelope. Were the City to be appropriately zoned, we are confident the number of Committee of Adjustment hearings would be reduced, thereby reducing the number of appeals at the OMB (or the LAB, if enacted). In this vein, the OAA would reiterate feedback contained in the original staff report: "Some participants also felt that improving the COA, prior to LAB implementation, could potentially reduce the overall number of appeals filed and subsequently the need to establish a LAB."

They also stated:

"On a related note, the OAA was compelled to intervene last year over the City's appointments to the COA, after Councillors willfully circumvented the City's own policy to appoint members that should otherwise have been ineligible. This action remains of great concern to the OAA. This kind of politicization should not be happening at the COA, and absolutely cannot happen if the City proceeds with establishing a LAB".

We fully agree with all the recommendations of the Ontario Association of Architects.
The full letter will be attached to my submission to you.

Whoever you select to be on the EY COA panel, we wish them the best of luck.

Regards

David Matoc
Vibrant Long Branch
Advocating for a Revitalized and Vibrant Long Branch

