

Attention, City Clerk:
Nancy Martins, Planning and Housing Committee, Toronto
pfc@toronto.ca

EHON - Expanding Housing Options in Neighbourhoods
Public Meeting July 15, 2025

Dear Sirs and Madames,

I am a resident on a unique little street in Toronto called Craven Road. On my street are some of the smallest homes on some of the smallest lots in the city. My house is 483 Sq Ft on a lot that is approximately 1216 Sq ft. Neighbours to either side are on lots of approximately the same size and we all live on one side of our narrow street with the longest wooden city-owned fence on the opposite side. Neighbours in the street to the rear of my property have lots approx 2800 Sq ft to 3800 Sq ft.

There are many neighbourhoods in this city where housing can be built or expanded without compromising green space or quality of life but the lot sizes and impact on neighbourhoods need to be taken into consideration.

Having read the plans and intentions, there appears to be safeguards in place to protect our tree canopy; minimize the impact of rain and water run-off; and maintain the quality of life of the neighbourhood. However in practice, these safeguards are neither being monitored nor adhered to.

I for one am in favour of infill housing, garden suites, laneway suites and multiplexes. But these structures need to be positioned and built with thought and not imposed in unsuitable areas. I do object to a large building proposed to the rear of my back yard, less than 6 metres from the rear of my house. The properties to the rear of the Craven Road have large enough yards to build a garden suite or "granny suite" but these suites need to let neighbours on all sides enjoy their own yard without losing property values. The suite being proposed to the rear of my property will be twice the height of my house and dominate my property without impacting the actual owners who plan on renting it and thereby profiting. Infill suites that could fall into this "as-of-right" category need to be, at the minimum, equidistant from all existing homes in the surrounding lots.

The mature trees that make our neighbourhood more attractive and healthy should not be compromised to build accommodations for only 1 or 2 people. Care needs to be taken to protect mature trees and not remove them for the sake of a few centimetres of the owners property. Unscrupulous independent arborists hired by property owners should not be allowed to dictate which trees can be killed. Any permits applied for to remove mature trees need to be made public and the people affected by the removal of the tree, that is all those in the shade area or within 2 lots, should be informed before the permit is issued. Those who are shared owners of these trees need to have their voices protected and not just ignored when trees are removed without permission. Two mature and healthy trees have been removed from the rear property I

am concerned with, one of which was shared and permission was denied. The city has seen fit to do nothing, ignoring their own rules and denying support to the shared owners. How does this attitude from the city's urban forestry department meet the city objectives of maximum tree canopy?

There is also a beautiful silver maple that has been badly injured, possibly fatally and the proposed garden suite may be built right up to the trunk base causing further stress to this beautiful tree.

Garden suites have no parking considerations and my neighbourhood has a parking problem. There are very few driveways on Craven with such small lots, so we have permitted street parking. The streets to the East, Rhodes; West, Ashdale; and North, Gerrard also have permitted on-street parking but due to lack of spaces, vehicles from Gerrard, Rhodes and Ashdale quite often park on Craven leaving some residents of Craven having to park a long way from home. We do not have parking spaces for more vehicles. Permits should be limited to a maximum of 2 per property and only to those in the main building. Any suite added should not be issued a parking permit. This won't be a problem where lots are larger and streets less dense but in my neighbourhood it has become a sore point.

There are many other considerations as densification is embraced such as rainwater run off/absorption, sewage, traffic congestion, public transit, hospital services etc etc, but I do not know enough about these subjects.

Thank-you,

Ailsa McFarlane
457 Craven Road