



Ontario Land Tribunal

655 Bay Street, Suite 1500, Toronto, ON M5G 1E5

Tel: 416-212-6349 | 1-866-448-2248

Web Site: olt.gov.on.ca

**Participant Status
Request Form and Participant Statement Form**

This form is expected to be provided at least 10 days in advance of the first hearing event to the Tribunal and all parties. Please contact the assigned Tribunal Case Coordinator to verify the relevant contact information for the parties. A paper copy of this form must also be provided to the Tribunal Member at the first hearing event.

Important: This form includes your written request for participant status and your participant statement. The presiding Tribunal Member will consider your request and the participant statement provided below at the hearing event prior to determining whether to grant you participant status and accept your participant statement.

Date:

Case Information

Tribunal Case No.:

Date of Case Management Conference/Hearing:

Contact Information

Last Name:

First Name:

Company Name:

Telephone Number:

Email Address:

Representative Contact Information (if applicable)

Last Name:

Ref: Case OLT-24-000882
From: Peter Martin
Page 1.

I am writing to object to the proposal in the subject case.
Please see the attached letter for my input.

Notes:

1. Please refer to Rule 7.7 of the OLT's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* and section 17 of the *Ontario Land Tribunal Act* regarding the requirements for preparing a participant statement.
2. The OLT issues all correspondence to parties and participants electronically.
3. Personal information or documentation requested on this form is collected under the authority of the *Ontario Land Tribunal Act* and the legislation under which the proceeding is commenced.
4. All information collected is included in the OLT case file and the public record in this proceeding.
5. In accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and section 9 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, all information collected is available to the public subject to limited exceptions.

I am writing to object to the proposal in the subject case on the following grounds:

1. The project is isolated from arterial roads and is accessed by two roads classified as local. For the quadrupling in density and concomitant increase in traffic, the developer has made no proposal or indication on how to solve the local traffic issue off of the property.
2. This is in a residential neighbourhood on two lane roads classified as "local". The property is an island, a historical accident in the midst of quiet, narrow streets, with no stop lights, and with no arterial access to Lakeshore. Only two narrow streets are to provide access, the major one (Long Branch) is barely wide enough for two dump trucks to pass and has 3 foot wide sidewalks. Every child from the west side of 33rd to the edge of Mississauga who attends public school will cross this road that trucks will be rumbling up and down for FIFTEEN years. Given the way trucks seem to kill people in Toronto, it seems sadly reasonable that an inevitable tragedy will occur here.
3. The proposal directs at least half vehicle traffic on 33rd street. The traffic study completed for this project was during summer and at covid and drastically underestimates the flow along 33rd street, and thus by their ratios, drastically undestimates the final traffic from the proposal. Most importantly, the intersection at 33rd and Marina Street is a focal point for all public school student traffic from the West side of James S. Bell to the edge of Mississauga, and on the townhouse projects north of Lakeshore -- as students access the school from the gate on Marina. The entire student traffic is moves across the intersection directly where traffic from the proposal has accelerated up to the stop sign, from the more than decade of construction traffic mixed in with ever-increasing car traffic. No proposal or amendment for the project was made for this, though it was raised repeatedly at public consultations.
4. The "revised" proposal is to cut off Lake Promenade in front of the development, giving the development essentially a private access to the water. The road structure in Long Branch means that Park Blvd would be the only East-West access across Long Branch. That is loss of connectivity. It will also delay Emergency Services if they find themselves on the wrong side of the division, if there is for instance construction on Park Av, as was recently the case (photo can be provided). The Fire Marshall has to weigh in on this. The proposal leads to an isolation of the Long Branch community, a REDUCTION in it's accessibility and connectivity.
5. TOO LONG. The building time frame was given as 15 years. Now 10 to 13 years is being waved around. Lets understand things always get delayed and go with the original timeframe. It's absurd. This is not temporary! Think about what that means: after building has started, a family could move onto the street, have a baby, grow up and go to the Thomas berry daycare at the top of the street, graduate to kindergarten and go through grades 1 to 8 at James S. Bell and graduate there as a 14 year old and NEVER KNOW A TIME WHERE THERE WEREN'T dump trucks and construction trucks and trade vans and beep beep beep going all day long. HOW IS THAT CONSIDERED "REASONABLE"? WHO DECIDES THAT IS "REASONABLE"? Would YOU want to live next to that, for FIFTEEN years? The very thought of someone deeming the essentially life-long disruption for many of Long Branches residents is infuriating.

6. Parking. The illusion that modern zoning and city rules state that few will use cars in new developments, and so very limited parking can be provided, is easily dispatched by simple night time walks around this very neighborhood. The townhouse complex at Marina and Long Branch Av, where Marina used to be an empty street is now lined with cars all night. The mini apartment buildings at the bottom of 33rd street were built with 1960's parking rules but still 33rd is lined with cars every night from there. Despite what the city and advisors think, people need to get to work and with the dis-localization of industry, people need cars to get there. The obvious result with the subject proposal, with the massive density and diminished parking, is that the entire of Long Branch will become a distant parking lot as residents drive around looking for some place to rest. Parking is expensive to build and developers don't want to do that, and somehow have convinced the City, willingly or not, that investment is not necessary.

7. Domination of Long Branch. Our friendly local community, with street festivals and neighbours, would now be dominated by this monstrous proposal. It will dominate all things in Long Branch and divide all action here. Where will be the common ground when the ideals of the community are split in two? The concept of Long Branch as a community with a common theme and purpose will be destroyed.

8. Over-development. Developers love to advertise to buyers the community they're about to destroy. The public services in Long Branch are already over-subscribed. Stop mentioning parks and open space! There's more to a community that a place for your dog to poop! The James S. Bell Junior Middle school will already be at capacity with families from the WestShore development - where are all the children going to school from this massive new influx? The WestShore boardings already have the obligatory posting from the Catholic School board saying you'll be out of luck. The Long Branch Library desks are full on many weekdays.

In summary, as related in the public meetings, the massive "stuffed-to-the-gills", "barely-breaks-guidelines-but-every-inch-for-profit" scale of the proposal causes so many problems, so much disruption and such a reduction in the public realm it should be rejected by the tribunal. Why does this generation want to build such absurd places, only to be paid for by the generations after? Those that came before us designed and built reasonable and beautiful places that fit the community together as a harmonious whole. The existing buildings on the site were built durable and fit the scale of the community without dominating or disrupting it.

Reject it.