

HERITAGE VAUGHAN COMMITTEE – APRIL 21, 2021**COMMUNICATIONS****Distributed April 14, 2021**

	<u>Item</u>
C1. Ms. Deborah Alexander, Alexander Planning Inc..	1
C2. Sonny Goldstein and Betty Rozendaal.	1

Distributed April 19, 2021

C3. Ms. Deborah Alexander, Alexander Planning Inc..	1
---	---

Distributed April 20, 2021

C4. Mr. Adam Birrell, The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), dated April 20, 2021.	1
C5. Ms. Valerie Burke, dated April 21, 2021.	1
C6. Presentation material, submitted by Azam Khan.	1

Disclaimer Respecting External Communications

Communications are posted on the City's website pursuant to Procedure By-law Number 7-2011. The City of Vaughan is not responsible for the validity or accuracy of any facts and/or opinions contained in external Communications listed on printed agendas and/or agendas posted on the City's website.

Please note there may be further Communications.

C1
Communication
Heritage Vaughan – April 21, 2021
Item # 1

From: [Bellisario, Adelina](#)
To: [Bellisario, Adelina](#)
Subject: FW: [External] 7714 Yonge Street - Heritage Vaughan Response
Date: April-13-21 10:12:48 AM
Attachments: [2021-04-07 Response letter re Heritage Vaughan.pdf](#)
[2021-04-08 Elevations.pdf](#)
[2021-04-08 Renderings.pdf](#)
[2021-04-08 Site Plan.pdf](#)
[Arborist Report and TIPP compressed.zip](#)

From: Deborah Alexander <deborah@alexanderplanning.ca>
To: "Borcescu, Nick" <Nick.Borcescu@vaughan.ca>, "Guy, Katrina" <Katrina.Guy@vaughan.ca>, "Antoine, Mark" <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>
Subject: [External] 7714 Yonge Street - Heritage Vaughan Response

Good morning Nick,

Please review the attached response letter and updated documents. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you

deb

Deborah Alexander, MES, MCIP, RPP

Alexander Planning Inc.

Land Use Planning

63 Gunning Crescent
Tottenham, ON L0G 1W0
905-716-7430
deborah@alexanderplanning.ca
www.alexanderplanning.ca

Confidential. This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains information that is privileged and confidential. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited.

April 7, 2021

Mr. Nick Borcescu, Senior Heritage Planner
City of Vaughan Development Planning Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive
Vaughan, ON
L6A 1T1

Dear Mr. Borcescu,

**Re: Heritage Vaughan Committee – April 21, 2021, 2298118 Ontario Inc.
7714 Yonge Street, City File DA.14.009; Reginal File SP-V-016-14**

In response to comments received from the public and members of the Heritage Committee during the course of the Heritage Vaughan Committee meeting held on March 24, 2021, we are pleased to provide the enclosed Arborist Report, Tree Preservation Plan, revised Site Plan, Elevations and Renderings in support of the proposed conversion of the W.D. Stark House for medical offices, pharmacy and café on the subject property.

There were a number of comments raised at the meeting related to preservation of the trees on the site. As you are aware, we have worked diligently with staff over the last several years to retain as many of the trees on the site as possible. Steps include revisions to the site plan to preserve additional trees and the inclusion of such elements as the retention of existing concrete to protect tree roots where feasible and hand removal of these elements where retention is not possible. In addition, as outlined in the Arborist Report, the use of geocells and permeable materials is proposed. We are confident these measures will preserve as many of the trees on the site as possible.

There were also some comments suggesting that the driveway access be shared with the Bell building next door. However, we note that this option was explored early in the process and it was found that the existing grades on the site are such that a shared driveway is not feasible. Further, Bell Canada has previously raised liability issues. As a result, we were not able to provide for a shared driveway with Bell.

Additional comments were received which suggested the use of concrete barriers during the construction phase to prevent construction vehicles from accessing the rear of the property via the existing north driveway. We have no concerns with this suggestion and barriers can be included in the construction drawings at the appropriate stage in the approvals process.

We also note that the owner of property at 25 Elizabeth Street raised some concerns regarding construction impacts to residents of his coach house. We note that the proposed building is two stories in height and is located approximately 36 metres from the mutual property line. We further note that all landscaping and trees along the west and southwest

corners of the property are to be retained and protected during construction. We do not anticipate any significant construction impacts to the neighbouring properties. However, we understand that this individual has undertaken to investigate impacts through an assessment report. We would respectfully request that we be provided with a copy of this report so that we can work with this property owner to alleviate any concerns which may remain.

We also heard comments related to the amount of hard surface included as part of the proposed pedestrian plaza immediately adjacent to Yonge Street. Again, we wish to point out that significant effort has gone into planning for the creation of a pedestrian area which will enhance the Yonge Street urban fabric while encouraging members of the public to pause and enjoy the streetscape. We note that approximately half of the proposed pedestrian plaza will feature soft landscaping while the remaining area will be interlocked paving to facilitate mobility and access to the building. For clarity, the site plan has been revised to indicate that the landscape area in the front yard is intended to be soft surface. The rendering has also been updated to remove the north fence and more clearly identify the property line between the subject property and the property to the north.

We were also made aware of concerns regarding bird safety as it relates to the proposed one storey breezeway connecting the new construction. In response, we have made notes on the elevation plan that the breezeway is to include bird friendly glass to prevent bird injuries. Similarly, glass railings in the pedestrian plaza have been removed from the plan.

We also received a comment regarding the sign on the front of the pharmacy. We would like to point out that this is not an illuminated box sign. Rather, it is a sign which consists entirely of lettering painted directly on the glass window in the style of a heritage store front. The actual graphic will be detailed at a later stage in the process.

Technical comments related to vibration, interior construction, documentation of the outbuilding and protection of the original siding, among others, will be dealt with as part of the Conservation Plan for Heritage Resources currently being prepared by Common Bond Collective and Michael Scott Architect Inc. This plan will be forwarded to you as soon as it becomes available.


We trust this information and the enclosed documents adequately respond to comments raised at the March 24 Heritage Vaughan Committee Meeting and we look forward to continuing to work with staff to bring this project to fruition. Should you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,
Alexander Planning Inc.



Deborah Alexander, MES, MCIP, RPP
Principal, Alexander Planning Inc.



cc: Roman Vorotynskiy



SITE STATISTICS	
LOT AREA	1676.7 M ²
SITE COVERAGE	
EXISTING BUILDING	60.3 M ²
PROPOSED LINK	8.8 M ²
PROPOSED ADDITION	291.8 M ²
TOTAL	360.9 M ²
	21.5%
FLOOR AREAS	
FIRST FLOOR EXISTING	60.3 M ²
SECOND FLOOR RENOVATED	22.3 M ²
LINK NEW	8.8 M ²
FIRST FLOOR NEW	282.2 M ²
SECOND FLOOR NEW	285.6 M ²
TOTAL	659.2 M ²
FLOOR SPACE INDEX	0.39
NEW BASEMENT	282.2 M ²
BUILDING HEIGHT	8.1 M

PARKING CALCULATIONS	
RETAIL (NEW MAIN FLOOR & LINK)	282.2 M ² + 8.8 M ²
+ (2 FLOORS EXISTING HOUSE)	60.3 + 22.3 M ²
=	373.6 M ² / 100 X 2.0 = 7.5 SPACES
MEDICAL (SECOND FLOOR)	
285.6 M ² / 100 X 2.5 =	7.2 SPACES
TOTAL PARKING REQUIRED	=14.7 OR 15 SPACES
PARKING PROVIDED	15 SPACES
CAFE AREA	
FIRST FLOOR EXISTING BUILDING	60.3 M ²
FIRST FLOOR LINK	8.8 M ²
SECOND FLOOR EXISTING BUILDING	22.3 M ²
TOTAL CAFE AREA	91.4 M ²



LANDSCAPING CALCULATIONS	
2.4M LANDSCAPE BUFFER	49.0 M ²
EXISTING HOUSE/PORCH	74.8 M ²
LINK	8.8 M ²
PROPOSED ADDITION	291.8 M ²
DRIVE/PARKING/CURBS	783.6 M ²
PLAZA/WALKS (FRONT & REAR)	181.6 M ² = 10.8% OF SITE
SOFT LANDSCAPING (SOFT AREAS A TO G)	378.1 M ² = 22.6% OF SITE



DRAWING NOTES

SITE PLAN AND GRADING TAKEN FROM SURVEYOR'S REAL PROPERTY REPORT OF PART 1 PLAN OF LOT 59, CITY OF VAUGHAN, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK, BY R.G. MCKIBBON, ONTARIO LAND SURVEYOR, DATED 25 JULY 2011.

No	Date	Description	By
9	06 APR/21	SNOW STORAGE/RAILING	BA
8	15 FEB/20	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA
7	09 DEC/20	ADDED YIELD SIGNS	BA
6	08 DEC/20	REISSUED FOR SPA	BA
5	11 APR/17	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA
4	17 FEB/17	ISSUED TO CONSULTANTS	BA
3	13 FEB/17	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA
2	10 FEB/17	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA
1	03 FEB/17	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA

REVISIONS	
	
This drawing is not to be used for construction until signed by the Architect.	
	
Date	JANUARY 2017
Drawn	BA
Checked	
Approved	
CAD Version	AUTOCAD 2016

These drawings shall not be scaled. The Contractor shall verify all dimensions, datums, and levels prior to beginning the Work. All errors and omissions to be reported immediately to the Architect. Variations and modifications to work shown on this drawing shall not be carried out without the written consent of the Architect. This drawing is the exclusive property of the Architect and shall not be reproduced without the Architect's permission.



47 Loweswater Ave.
Unionville, Ontario, L3R 7W8
napadesign@rogers.com
416 930-6337

Brian Awde Architect Inc.
628 Cummer Avenue North York
Ontario M2K 2M8
Tel: (416) 226-5183 Fax: (416) 226-3266
e-mail: brianawde@sympatico.ca

Project:
7714 YONGE STREET
VAUGHAN ONTARIO

Drawing Name:
PRELIMINARY
SITE PLAN

Scale 1:200 Revision No 9

Project No 16.17 Drawing No SK-1



DRAWING NOTES

7	08 APR/21	BIRD FRIENDLY GLASS	BA
6	15 FEB/21	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA
5	12 FEB/21	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA
4	08 DEC/20	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA
3	02 MAY/18	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA
2	22 JAN/18	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA
1	19 OCT/17	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	BA

REVISIONS

These drawings shall not be scaled. The Contractor shall verify all dimensions, datums, and levels prior to beginning the Work. All errors and omissions to be reported immediately to the Architect. Variations and modifications to work shown on this drawing shall not be carried out without the written consent of the Architect. This drawing is the exclusive property of the Architect and shall not be reproduced without the Architect's permission.

ONTARIO ASSOCIATION
OF
ARCHITECTS
BRIAN AWDE
LICENCE
2215

16.17

This drawing is not to be used for construction until signed by the Architect.

--- --

Date
OCTOBER 2017

Drawn
BA

Checked

Approved

CAD Version
AUTOCAD 2018

Brian Awde Architect Inc.
628 Cummer Avenue North York
Ontario M2K 2M8
Tel: (416) 226-5183 Fax: (416) 226-3266
e-mail: brianawde@sympatico.ca

napa
designgroup

47 Loweswater Ave.
Unionville, Ontario, L3R 7W8
napadesign@rogers.com
416 930-6337

Project
7714 YONGE STREET
VAUGHAN ONTARIO

Drawing Name
NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATIONS

Scale
1/4" = 1'-0"

Revision No
7

Project No
16.17

Drawing No
SK-4



VIEW FROM YONGE STREET NORTH



VIEW FROM REAR PARKING LOT



VIEW FROM YONGE STREET SOUTH



AERIAL VIEW

DRAWING NOTES

No	Date	Description	By
REVISIONS			
3	08 APR/21	REVISED MODEL	BA
2	15 FEB/21	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA
1	08 DEC/20	ISSUED FOR SPA	BA

These drawings shall not be scaled. The Contractor shall verify all dimensions, datums, and levels prior to beginning the Work. All errors and omissions to be reported immediately to the Architect. Variations and modifications to work shown on this drawing shall not be carried out without the written consent of the Architect. This drawing is the exclusive property of the Architect and shall not be reproduced without the Architect's permission.



Date	OCTOBER 2017
Drawn	BA
Checked	
Approved	
CAD Version	AUTOCAD 2018

Brian Awde Architect Inc.
628 Cummer Avenue North York
Ontario M2K 2M8
Tel: (416) 226-5183 Fax: (416) 226-3266
e-mail: brianawde@sympatico.ca

napad designgroup
47 Loweswater Ave.
Unionville, Ontario, L3R 7W8
napadesign@rogers.com
416 930-6337

Project	
7714 YONGE STREET VAUGHAN ONTARIO	
Drawing Name	
RENDERINGS	
Scale	N/A
Project No	16.17
Revision No	3
Drawing No	SK-6



Roman Vorontynskiy
c/o Alexander Planning Inc.
72 Herefordshire Crescent
East Gwillimbury, ON L9N 0B6

Arborist Report

7714 Yonge Street, Vaughan, ON

7 March 2017, revised 1 April 2021

Introduction

An Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan was completed for the property located at 7714 Yonge Street in Vaughan, Ontario. The subject area is located south of Highway 407 and west of Yonge Street. The City of Vaughan's 'Private Property Tree Protection By-law no. 185-2007' is applicable to the subject property.

Existing Conditions and Proposed Works

An existing two-storey building with driveway and detached garage is found on the subject property. The proposed work includes the demolition of the detached garage, addition to the existing building, and associated parking, driveway and landscaping. Refer to the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1) for the existing conditions and the proposed site plan.

Methodology

Field assessments to collect tree inventory data were conducted on 23 February 2017. The health and condition of the trees was re-assessed 21 October 2019, and 1 October 2020.

Tree Inventory

Trees greater than 15cm diameter at breast height (DBH) on the subject property, within proximity of disturbance on neighbouring property and within the City road allowance, were included in the tree inventory. Trees inventoried were numbered 1-44 and tree polygons (groups of trees) were identified with the prefix 'P'.

Species, diameter at breast height (DBH), health, condition, dripline and relevant comments were recorded for each inventoried tree. Tree resources were located by the topographic survey provided or approximately located using aerial photo interpretation and estimations made in the field. Refer to Table 1 for a brief description of the assessment methodology, Table 2 for the detailed tree inventory, and the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1) for the location of the trees.

Table 1. Brief Description of Assessment Methodology and Criteria

Species	Common and Scientific Names	
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height (1.4m above ground)	(cm); ~ = approximately
TI	Trunk Integrity	G=good, F=fair, P=poor
CS	Crown Structure	G=good, F=fair, P=poor
CV	Crown Vigour	G=good, F=fair, P=poor
CDB	Crown Die Back	(%)
DL	Dripline, distance measured from the centre of the tree to the outer tips of the branches (m)	
Comments	Relevant comments to health and condition of the tree	
Action	Retain or Remove	
Ownership	Neighbouring, Private, Shared or City	

Results

Tree Inventory

A total of 42 trees and two tree polygons were inventoried on the subject property, on neighbouring property and within the City road allowance. Trees 1 to 7, 9 to 11, 13 to 18, 21 to 25, 27 to 34, 36 to 40, 42 to 44 and a portion of P8 and P26 are greater than 20cm DBH and are protected by the Private Tree Protection By-law.

Tree species found include: Manitoba Maple (*Acer negundo*), Horsechestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*), Black Locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*), Norway Maple (*Acer plantanoides*), White Spruce (*Picea glauca*), Basswood (*Tilia americana*), Eastern White Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), Black Walnut (*Juglans nigra*), Ivory Silk (*Syringa reticulata*), White Elm (*Ulmus americana*), and Sugar Maple (*Acer saccharum*). Refer to Table 2 for the detailed tree inventory and Appendix A for photos of the trees.

Analysis and Discussion

Tree Preservation

The preservation of Trees 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 to 16, 18, 31 to 35, and 37 to 42, may be possible with the use of appropriate tree preservation measures, as described below.

A concrete pad is located within the dripline of Trees 1 and is to be removed gently by hand and supervised by a Certified Arborist. Tree protection hoarding around this tree must be installed immediately following the demolition phase. Any disturbance must be mitigated, for example, stabilize and restore the disturbed area with topsoil to existing grades.

An existing garage is located within the driplines of Trees 9 and 12. The preservation of these trees may be possible if the existing base of the garage is used or is removed gently using hand tools only, being careful not to damage the roots. Demolition of the existing garage should be completed using hand tools or light equipment only. Tree protection hoarding around this tree must be installed immediately

following the demolition phase. Any disturbance must be mitigated, for example, stabilize and restore the disturbed area with topsoil to existing grades.

It is recommended that the proposed parking area and walkway within the driplines of Trees 9 and 12 be installed using a combination of geocell and permeable materials to minimize soil compaction, and allow for water infiltration, and as close to existing grades as possible. Any work within the driplines of trees must be supervised by a Certified Arborist. These trees should be monitored for changes in health, condition and structural stability by a Certified Arborist during and following construction. The supervising Arborist must confirm that the trees are safe to be retained.

Encroachment into the driplines of Trees 1, 12, 14, 18, 31 to 35, 37, and 38, will be required to accommodate the proposed parking area, walkway, and/or hardscape. Any required excavation should be conducted by hand, air spade or hydro-vac to expose roots for assessment and pruning. It is recommended that the proposed parking area within the driplines of these trees to be installed using a combination of geocell and permeable materials to minimize soil compaction, and allow for water infiltration, and as close to existing grades as possible. Any required root pruning should be conducted by a Certified Arborist following good arboricultural standards. Any work within the dripline of trees should be supervised by a Certified Arborist. These trees should be monitored for changes in health, condition and structural stability by a Certified Arborist during and following construction. The supervising Arborist must confirm that the trees are safe to be retained. Cabling of the union of Tree 42 is recommended.

Any potential injury to neighbouring and shared trees should be discussed and accepted by the neighbouring property owner prior to development. Trees 2, 7, 11, 13, 17, and 22, are in poor condition or potentially hazardous and the appropriate neighbours should be notified. The tree protection hoarding for trees to be preserved should consist of a wood frame made of 2" x 4"s with plywood hoarding, to be installed according to the detail shown on the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1). The tree protection barriers should be installed prior to demolition and construction and remain in place throughout the construction process, as specified in the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1). No grade changes, storage of materials or equipment is permitted within the tree protection zone (TPZ). The tree protection hoarding detail and tree protection notes, are shown on the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1). Dripline distances are shown in Table 2 of this report.

Tree Removal

The removal of Trees 3, 4, 6, 23 to 25, 27, 29, 30, 36, 43, 44, and tree polygons P8 and P26, will be required to accommodate the proposed development. A permit will be required for the removal of all trees greater than 20cm in diameter. Tree 19 is located within the City road allowance; permission from the City will be required prior to its removal. Trees 4 and 23 are located on neighbouring property or are shared.

Trees 2, 11, 13, 17, 20, 22, and 28 are in poor and declining condition and are recommended for removal regardless of the proposed construction. Trees 2, 7, 11, 13, 17, and 22, are located on neighbouring property or are shared trees. Trees within striking distance of the proposed development are recommended for removal to prevent injury/damage to persons/property. The neighbouring property owner should be notified of the condition of these trees and co-ordinate their removal. The removal of neighbouring and shared trees will require permission from the neighbouring property

owner prior to removal. Tree 21 has been removed since the initial inventory was completed. Refer to Figure 1 for the location of proposed tree removals.

Conclusion and Recommendations

A total of 42 trees and 2 tree polygons were inventoried on the subject property, on neighbouring property and within the City road allowance. Trees 1 to 7, 9 to 11, 13 to 18, 21 to 25, 27 to 34, 36 to 40, 42 to 44 and a portion of P8 and P26 are greater than 20cm DBH and are protected by the Private Tree Protection By-law. The removal of Trees 3, 4, 6, 23 to 25, 27, 29, 30, 36, 43, 44, and tree polygons P8 and P26 will be required to accommodate the proposed development. Trees 2, 11, 13, 17, 20, 22, and 28 are in poor and declining condition and are recommended for removal regardless of the proposed construction. All other trees may be preserved given appropriate tree protection measures as described in this report are implemented.

Tree protection measures should be installed prior to any construction work, as discussed in this report. Tree protection fencing should be implemented at distances noted in Table 2 and shown in the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1) and maintained throughout the construction process. Refer to the Tree Preservation Plan (Figure 1) for further information regarding tree protection.

Respectfully Submitted,



Amy Choi, B.Sc.(Env.), M.Sc.F.
Principal, Consulting Arborist and Forest Ecologist
ISA Certified Arborist #ON-1609A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
Certified Butternut Assessor #024

AMY CHOI CONSULTING

c: 647.983.8817

e-mail: info@achoiconsulting.ca

web: www.achoiconsulting.ca

Table 2. Detailed Tree Inventory

Date: 23 February 2017 (21 October 2019)(1 October 2020) Surveyors: AC

Location: 7714 Yonge Street, Vaughan

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	Diameter at Breast Height (DBH)	Trunk Integrity	Crown Structure	Crown Vigour	Crown Dieback	Dripline, radius	minimum Tree Protection Zone	Comments	Action	Ownership
			(cm)	Good (G), Fair (F), Poor (P)			%	(m)	(m)			
1	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	~30	F	F	F		4.5	2.4	Light lean towards north, moderate dead branches, co-dominant at 2.5m, moderate exposed roots	Preserve	Neighbouring
2	Horsechestnut	<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	23,24.5	PF	PF	PF	25	4	2.4	Moderate epicormic branching, moderate stem wound with rot, small crown, heavy crack, U-union at 0.1m	Remove-poor condition	Shared
3	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	45	PF	F	F		3	3	Cavity at base with rot, moderate lean towards east, moderate sweep, moderate asymmetrical crown, major stem wound with decay	Remove-development	Private
4	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~25	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Light lean towards north, U-shaped co-dominance at 4m, light stem wound with rot, conflict with fence	Remove-development	Neighbouring
5	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~26	FG	FG	F		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards north, light dead branches	Preserve	Neighbouring
6	White Spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>	23	FG	FG	F	15	4	1.8	Gall, light exposed roots, moderate root wounds	Remove-development	Private
7	Catalpa	<i>Catalpa sp.</i>	~28	PF	P	P		3	1.8	Dead/dying	Preserve	Neighbouring
P8	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	2-24, avg. 14	FG	FG	F		-	1.8	4 trees	Remove-development	Private
9	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	109	FG	FG	F		11	6.54	Co-dominant at 3m with included bark, light pruning wounds, moderate dead branches	Preserve-monitor	Shared
10	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~24	FG	FG	FG		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards north	Preserve	Neighbouring
11	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	80.5	P	F	F	10	10.75	5.4	Seam, heavy stem wound with rot, rot at base, crack from base to union, decay at union, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
12	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~15	F	F	F		3	1.8	1 stem dead, U-union at 0.5m, small cavity, bowed due to competition	Preserve-monitor	Neighbouring

13	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	64	F	PF	PF		8	4.2	Moderate exposed roots, included chain link fence, moderate lean towards south, heavy epicormic branching, moderate growth deficit at base on south side, heavy pruning wounds, topped at 8m, major stem wound with cavity, transverse crack in branch failed, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
14	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~34	FG	FG	FG		3	2.4	Light lean towards north, light asymmetrical crown	Preserve-tentative	Neighbouring
15	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	33	FG	F	F		6.5	2.4	Light lean towards northwest, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition	Preserve	Shared
16	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	20	G	F	F		6.5	1.8	Conflict with Tree 17, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition	Preserve	Private
17	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	78	F	F	F		11	4.8	Moderate epicormic branching, U-union at 2.5m, light lean towards east, broken branches, stem wound at base with rot, dead branches with moderate decay, fruiting bodies, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
18	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~50	FG	FG	FG		8	3.0	Light lean towards east, light asymmetrical crown, union at 4m	Preserve-monitor	Shared
19	Ivory Silk	<i>Syringa reticulata</i>	14.5	F	F	F		1.5	1.8	Moderate pruning wounds, small stem flare, moderate asymmetrical crown	Remove-development	City
20	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	16	DEAD				-	-	Dead/dying	REMOVE-DEAD	Private
21	Sugar Maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>	33.5	P	P	P		-	-	Topped at 2m, main branch dead, epicormic branches only	REMOVED	Shared
22	Sugar Maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>	39.5	DEAD				-	-	Topped at 2.25m, cavity/hollow stem with rot, moderate dead branches	REMOVE-DEAD	Shared
23	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	46	G	FG	FG		4	3.0	Light lean towards south, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition, moderate epicormic branching	Remove-development	Shared
24	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	58	G	F	FG		7	3.6	Moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition, moderate vertical scaffold limbs, moderate epicormic branching	Remove-development	Private
25	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	61	G	F	FG		7.5	4.2	Adjacent retaining wall, moderate pruning wounds on neighbouring property side, improper arboricultural standards, light asymmetrical crown, light epicormic branching	Remove-development	Private
P26	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	17.5,13	FG	F	F		3.5	1.8	2 trees, union at base, light lean, broken leaders	Remove-development	Private
	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	12	F	F	F		3.5	1.8			
27	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	16,10	FG	F	F		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards east, union at base, dead leader	Remove-development	Private
28	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	59	DEAD				6	-	Moderate growth deficit on west side, moderate girdling roots, sloughing bark at base, stem wound with rot, rot/crack at branch union, moderate dead branches, moderate asymmetrical crown, dead/dying, hazard	REMOVE-DEAD	Private
29	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	15,9,5	F	F	F		3	1.8	Union at base, vertical scaffold limbs	Remove-development	Private
30	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	45	F	F	F		4	3.0	Growth deficits/ribbing at base, light lean towards south, moderate asymmetrical crown, moderate pruning wounds, minor dead and broken branches	Remove-development	Private
31	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	23	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private

32	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	25	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private
33	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	21.13	F	F	PF		4	1.8	Union at base, conflict between stems	Preserve-monitor	Private
34	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	23,10	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Co-dominant at 2m	Preserve-monitor	Private
35	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	16	FG	F	PF		2	1.8	Top of crown dead	Preserve-monitor	Private
36	Sugar Maple	<i>Acer saccharum</i>	82	F	F	PF		10	5.4	Exposed roots with moderate root wounds, light seam, co-dominant at 1.4m with heavy included bark, moderate dead branches, light asymmetrical crown, hollow cavity	Remove-development	Private
37	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	21	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Light bow towards south, light growth deficit at base	Preserve-monitor	Private
38	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	18,10	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Union at base, light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private
39	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	20,14	PF	F	F		2	1.8	Union at 1m, included chain link fence, moderate bow, moderate poor form	Preserve	Shared
40	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	18,10,8	F	F	FG		4	1.8	Union at base, spiral fused stems	Preserve	Private
41	Eastern White Cedar	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	16	FG	G	G		3	1.8	Curved stem at base	Preserve	Private
42	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	79	PF	F	F		8	4.8	Conflict with fence, V-union at 1m with very heavy included bark and wetwood, heavy asymmetrical crown due to competition with Tree 43. cabling recommended	Preserve-monitor	Shared
43	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	73	PF	F	F		8.25	4.8	Heavy stem wound from base to union with decay , union at 3m, broken branches, light asymmetrical crown, cabling recommended	Remove-development	Private
44	White Spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>	22.5	F	G	G		5	1.8	Moderate stem wound, heavy exposed roots, small stem flare	Remove-development	Private
END												

Appendix A. Photos of Trees (2017)



Photo 1 Trees 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (left to right)



Photo 2 Tree 6 to 7 (left to right)



Photo 3 Tree polygon P8




Photo 4 Trees 9 and 10 (right to left)




Photo 5 Trees 9 and 11 (left to right)



Photo 6 Tree 12



Photo 7 Tree 13



Photo 8 Trees 14, 15, 16, 17 (left to right)



Photo 9 Tree 18




Photo 10 Tree 19



Photo 11 Tree 20, dead tree, 21 and 22 (left to right)



Photo 12 Trees 23 and 24 (left to right)



Photo 13 Tree 25




Photo 14 Tree polygon P26 and Tree 27 (left to right)



Photo 15 Tree 28, 29 and 30 (left to right)



Photo 16 Trees 31, 32, 33, 34 (left to right)



Photo 17 Trees 34, 35, 36 (left to right)



Photo 18 Trees 37, 38, 39, 40, 41



Photo 19 Trees 41, 42, 36 and 44 (left to right)



Photo 20 Trees 43 and 44 (left to right)

Table 1. Detailed Tree Inventory

Location: 7714 Yonge Street, Vaughan Date: 23 February 2017 (21 October 2019)(1 October 2020) Surveyors: AC


Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	Diameter at Breast Height (DBH)	Trunk integrity	Crown Structure	Crown Vigour	Crown Dieback	Drip-line, radius	Minimum Tree Protection Zone	Comments	Action	Ownership
			(cm)	Good (G), Fair (F), Poor (P)		%	(m)	(m)				
1	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	~30	F	F	F		4.5	2.4	Light lean towards north, moderate dead branches, co-dominant at 2.5m, moderate exposed roots	Preserve	Neighbouring
2	Horseshestnut	Aesculus hippocastanum	23.24.5	PF	PF	PF	25	4	2.4	Moderate epicormic branching, moderate stem wound with rot, small crown, heavy crack, U-union at 0.1m	Remove-poor condition	Shared
3	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	45	PF	F	F		3	3	Cavity at base with rot, moderate lean towards east, moderate sweep, moderate asymmetrical crown, major stem wound with decay	Remove-development	Private
4	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	~25	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Light lean towards north, U-shaped co-dominance at 4m, light stem wound with rot, conflict with fence	Remove-development	Neighbouring
5	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	~26	FG	FG	F		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards north, light dead branches	Preserve	Neighbouring
6	White Spruce	Picea glauca	23	FG	FG	F	15	4	1.8	Gall, light exposed roots, moderate root wounds	Remove-development	Private
7	Catalpa	Catalpa sp.	~28	PF	F	P		3	1.8	Dead/dying	Preserve	Neighbouring
P8	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	2-24, avg. 14	FG	FG	F		-	1.8	4 trees	Remove-development	Private
9	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	109	FG	FG	F		11	6.54	Co-dominant at 3m with included bark, light pruning wounds, moderate dead branches	Preserve-monitor	Shared
10	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	~24	FG	FG	FG		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards north	Preserve	Neighbouring
11	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	80.5	P	F	F	10	10.75	5.4	Seam, heavy stem wound with rot, rot at base, crack from base to union, decay at union, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
12	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	~15	F	F	F		3	1.8	1 stem dead, U-union at 0.5m, small cavity, bowed due to competition	Preserve-monitor	Neighbouring
13	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	84	F	PF	PF		8	4.2	Moderate exposed roots, included chain link fence, moderate lean towards south, heavy epicormic branching, moderate growth deficit at base on south side, heavy pruning wounds, topped at 8m, major stem wound with cavity, transverse crack in branch failed, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
14	Black Locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	~34	FG	FG	FG		3	2.4	Light lean towards north, light asymmetrical crown	Preserve-tentative	Neighbouring
15	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	33	FG	F	F		6.5	2.4	Light lean towards northwest, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition	Preserve	Shared
16	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	20	G	F	F		6.5	1.8	Conflict with Tree 17, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition	Preserve	Private
17	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	78	F	F	F		11	4.8	Moderate epicormic branching, U-union at 2.5m, light lean towards east, broken branches, stem wound at base with rot, dead branches with moderate decay, futility bodies, potential hazard => removal recommended	Remove-poor condition	Shared
18	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	~50	FG	FG	FG		8	3.0	Light lean towards east, light asymmetrical crown, union at 4m	Preserve-monitor	Shared
19	Ivory Silk	Syringa reticulata	14.5	F	F	F		1.5	1.8	Moderate pruning wounds, small stem flare, moderate asymmetrical crown	Remove-development	City
20	White Elm	Ulmus americana	16	DEAD				-	-	Dead/dying	REMOVE-DEAD	Private
21	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	33.5	P	P	P		-	-	Topped at 2m, main branch dead, epicormic branches only	REMOVED	Shared
22	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	39.5	DEAD				-	-	Topped at 2.25m, cavity/hollow stem with rot, moderate dead branches	REMOVE-DEAD	Shared
23	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	46	G	FG	FG		4	3.0	Light lean towards south, moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition, moderate epicormic branching	Remove-development	Shared
24	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	58	G	F	FG		7	3.6	Moderate asymmetrical crown due to competition, moderate vertical scaffold limbs, moderate epicormic branching	Remove-development	Private
25	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	61	G	F	FG		7.5	4.2	Adjacent retaining wall, moderate pruning wounds on neighbouring property side, improper arboricultural standards, light asymmetrical crown, light epicormic branching	Remove-development	Private
P26	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	17.5, 13	FG	F	F		3.5	1.8	2 trees, union at base, light lean, broken leaders	Remove-development	Private
27	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	16, 10	FG	F	F		2.5	1.8	Light lean towards east, union at base, dead leader	Remove-development	Private
28	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	59	DEAD				6	-	Moderate growth deficit on west side, moderate girdling roots, sloughing bark at base, stem wound with rot, rot/crack at branch union, moderate dead branches, moderate asymmetrical crown, dead/dying, hazard	REMOVE-DEAD	Private
29	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	15.9, 5	F	F	F		3	1.8	Union at base, vertical scaffold limbs	Remove-development	Private
30	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	45	F	F	F		4	3.0	Growth deficits/ripping at base, light lean towards south, moderate asymmetrical crown, moderate pruning wounds, minor dead and broken branches	Remove-development	Private
31	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	23	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private
32	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	25	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private
33	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	21, 13	F	F	PF		4	1.8	Union at base, conflict between stems	Preserve-monitor	Private
34	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	23, 10	G	FG	PF		4	1.8	Co-dominant at 2m	Preserve-monitor	Private
35	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	16	FG	F	PF		2	1.8	Top of crown dead	Preserve-monitor	Private
36	Sugar Maple	Acer saccharum	82	F	F	PF		10	5.4	Exposed roots with moderate root wounds, light seam, co-dominant at 1.4m with heavy included bark, moderate dead branches, light asymmetrical crown, hollow cavity	Remove-development	Private
37	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	21	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Light bow towards south, light growth deficit at base	Preserve-monitor	Private
38	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	18, 10	FG	FG	F		2	1.8	Union at base, light lean towards south	Preserve-monitor	Private
39	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	20, 14	PF	F	F		2	1.8	Union at 1m, included chain link fence, moderate bow, moderate poor form	Preserve	Shared
40	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	18, 10, 8	F	F	FG		4	1.8	Union at base, spiral fused stems	Preserve	Private
41	Eastern White Cedar	Thuja occidentalis	16	FG	G	G		3	1.8	Curved stem at base	Preserve	Private
42	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	79	PF	F	F		8	4.8	Conflict with fence, V-union at 1m with very heavy included bark and wetwood, heavy asymmetrical crown due to competition with Tree 43, cabling recommended	Preserve-monitor	Shared
43	Black Walnut	Juglans nigra	73	PF	F	F		8.25	4.8	Heavy stem wound from base to union with decay, union at 3m, broken branches, light asymmetrical crown, cabling recommended	Remove-development	Private
44	White Spruce	Picea glauca	22.5	F	G	G		5	1.8	Moderate stem wound, heavy exposed roots, small stem flare	Remove-development	Private

END

A existing garage is located within the driplines of Trees 9 and 12. The preservation of these trees may be possible if the existing base of the garage is used or is removed gently using hand tools only, being careful not to damage the roots. It is recommended that the proposed parking area and walkway within the driplines of these trees to be installed using a combination of geocell and permeable materials to minimize soil compaction, and allow for water infiltration, and as close to existing grades as possible. Any work within the driplines of trees must be supervised by a Certified Arborist. The Arborist must confirm that the trees may be safely retained. Refer to the Arborist report for additional details.

The concrete pad located within the dripline of Tree 1 is to be removed gently by hand and supervised by a Certified Arborist. The tree protection hoarding must be installed immediately following removal of the concrete pad and prior to construction. Refer to the Arborist report for additional details.

Encroachment into the driplines of Trees 1, 12, 14, 18, 31 to 35, 37, and 38, will be required to accommodate the proposed parking area, walkway, and/or hardscape. Any required excavation should be conducted by hand, air spade or hydro-vac to expose roots for assessment and pruning. It is recommended that the proposed surfaces within the driplines of these trees to be installed using a combination of geocell and permeable materials to minimize soil compaction, and allow for air and water infiltration, and as close to existing grades as possible. Any work within the dripline of trees should be supervised by a Certified Arborist. The Arborist must confirm that the trees may be safely retained. Refer to the Arborist report for additional details.



LEGEND

5 Tree Identification Number*

Surveyed Deciduous Tree Location

Surveyed Coniferous Tree Location

Approximate Tree Location

Approximate Dripline

Required Tree Protection Fencing

Tree Removal Required due to Development

Tree Removal Recommended due to Poor Condition

Previously Removed Tree

Refer to the Arborist Report dated 7 March 2017, revised 1 April 2019 for additional information and Table 1 of the Plan for the detailed tree inventory table. Trees were located using the topographic surveyed provided, or aerial photo interpretation and estimations made in the field.

Tree Protection Plan Notes

- It is the applicants' responsibility to discuss potential impacts to trees located near or wholly on adjacent properties or on shared boundary lines with their neighbours. Should such trees be injured to the point of instability or death the applicant may be held responsible through civil action. The applicant would also be required to replace such trees to the satisfaction of City of Vaughan.
- Tree protection barriers shall be installed as detailed on this Plan and to the satisfaction of City of Vaughan.
- Tree protection barriers must be installed using plywood clad hoarding (minimum 1/2" thick) or an equivalent approved by City of Vaughan.
- Prior to the commencement of any site activity such as site alteration, demolition or construction, the tree protection measures specified on this plan must be installed to the satisfaction of City of Vaughan.
- Once all tree/site protection measures have been installed, City of Vaughan staff must be contacted to arrange for an inspection of the site and approval of the tree/site protection requirements. Photographs that clearly show the installed tree/site protection shall be provided to City of Vaughan for review.
- Where changes to the location of the approved TPZ or sediment control or where temporary access to the TPZ is proposed, City of Vaughan must be contacted to obtain approval prior to alteration.
- Tree protection barriers must remain in place and in good condition during demolition, construction and/or site disturbance, including landscaping, and must not be altered, moved or removed until authorized by City of Vaughan.
- No construction activities including grade changes, surface treatments or excavation of any kind are permitted within the area identified on the Tree Protection Plan or Site Plan as a minimum tree protection zone (TPZ). No root cutting is permitted. No storage of materials or fill is permitted within the TPZ. No movement or storage of vehicles or equipment is permitted within the TPZ. The area(s) identified as a TPZ must be protected and remain undisturbed at all times.
- Any roots or branches indicated on this plan which require pruning, as approved by City of Vaughan, must be pruned by an arborist. All pruning of tree roots and branches must be in accordance with good arboricultural practice. Roots that have received approval from City of Vaughan to be pruned must first be exposed using pneumatic (air) excavation, by hand digging or by using a low pressure hydraulic (water) excavation. The water pressure for hydraulic excavation must be low enough that root bark is not damaged or removed. This will allow a proper pruning cut and minimize tear of the roots.
- The applicant/owner shall protect all by-law regulated trees in the area of consideration that have not been approved for removal throughout the development works to the satisfaction of City of Vaughan.
- Prior to site disturbance the owner must confirm that no migratory birds are making use of the site for nesting. The owner must ensure that the works are in conformance with the Migratory Bird Convention Act and that no migratory bird nests will be impacted by the proposed work.

Submission and Revision Notes

No.	Description	Date	By
3	Report and Plan Revisions	1 April 2021	AC
2	Report and Plan Revisions	7 February 2019	AC
1	Report and Plan Submission	7 March 2017	AC

Source Data: Ontario Land Surveyors (topo), Napa Design Group, Brian Awde Architect Inc. (site plan)

Project:
7714 Yonge Street
Vaughan, ON
Client:
Roman Vorontynskiy
c/o Alexander Planning Inc.
72 Herefordshire Crescent
East Gwillimbury, ON L9N 0B6
Date:
7 March 2017
Completed By:
Amy Choi Consulting
Amy Choi, B.Sc. (Env.), M.Sc.F., ISA Certified Arborist #ON-1609A
e: info@achoiconsulting.ca w: www.achoiconsulting.ca
c: 647.983.8817

TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

Figure 1 Scale 1:200

Report to the Heritage Committee regarding
RENOVATION OF THE EXISTING HERITAGE HOUSE ALONG WITH A
REAR ADDITION at 7714 Yonge Street.

We have specific concerns given the close proximity of the proposed expansion and construction to the coach house which is located at the back end of our property adjacent to the proposed renovation. This is where our 90 year old father is living. He is a holocaust survivor and is particularly sensitive to loud noises and vibration due to his war time experiences. He is in very good health, however we are concerned that his wellbeing both mentally and physically may be impacted by the construction and noise caused by the expansion of the property.

While this may not specifically be a concern of the Heritage Committee, there should be an overriding general concern of the effect on all residents of the heritage area.

What we are concerned about, that should also be a concern to the Heritage Committee, is that the entire heritage neighbourhood is being impacted by the commercialization on heritage properties. As an example, the proposed renovation recommends the removal of a number of trees in order to provide adequate parking spaces for the proposed business. According to the arborist report, several of the healthy trees will be removed to allow for 15 parking spaces. Those trees are part of the heritage nature of the property and should be preserved. As for the trees that remain, they will be impacted over time due to salting of the parking lot in the winter months, snow plowing, and water drainage and run off changes. The trees provide both a sound and visual barrier between our property and Yonge street as well as to the proposed renovation. The mature canopy also supports the heritage look of our property and surrounding neighbourhood.

This committee should stress that the final approved proposal take into consideration that all healthy trees remain that way.

We bought the property at ■ Elizabeth Street partly due to the fact that it was a heritage property in a heritage neighbourhood. That the neighbouring property be allowed to commercialize it changes the character of the entire neighbourhood. Maintaining the frontage facing Yonge Street is very important but your job should not end there. Given the close proximity of the subject property to ours and the other neighbours, the rear of the subject property should also be taken into consideration.

Currently the proposal has a small grass buffer between the fence line of our property and the parking lot. We propose that this buffer area be expanded by removing 2 of the parking spaces at the back end of the proposed expansion and the removal of the turning indent in order to provide additional privacy and maintain the character of a more densely planted area, much as it would have been in the heritage days. Signs asking people to back into those spaces, as are used in a multitude of other parking lots, would eliminate the need for that indent.

To achieve a more heritage look to the vegetation, we propose that this buffer area not only maintain the original trees and or vegetation on this area and but also recommend that additional local species of cedar trees and local species of ground cover be planted. Since most of the original trees are tall deciduous trees, the canopies will provide little visual and sound buffering especially in the winter months. Planting local species of cedars and expanding the buffer will also help to alleviate some of the noise. The indent at the rear of the parking lot, supposedly to allow parked cars to be able to back out of spaces, as already mentioned is unnecessary and will become a catch basin for salt laden snow, which upon melting could damage not only the existing vegetation but could also damage the coach house at the rear of our property. Our concern is that melting snow may seep towards our coach house, especially when such melting snow is combined with intense rainstorms and ice buildup in the spring, unless a sufficient soft surface buffer is maintained to absorb the runoff and melting snow.

We will address our concerns about the use of the property to the planning committee, but the heritage committee should lend support to those concerns if such usage will be for businesses open 24 hours a day or even if it is expected to be open into the evening hours and weekends. Late hour business openings create light pollution, security issues, noise and activities that will extend beyond the regular workday. Not only will that affect the enjoyment of our property in the evenings, or on weekends, but again will create an environment that is very far removed from the heritage area that you are trying to preserve, and we expected would remain when we bought the property.

I appreciate the opportunity to express these concerns to the Heritage Committee and will answer any questions you may have at the meeting on April 21st. If you need to contact me please do so at [REDACTED]

Respectfully,

Sonny Goldstein and Betty Rozendaal


[REDACTED] Elizabeth St. Thornhill, ON [REDACTED]

THIS DRAWING, UNLESS OTHERWISE STIPULATED HAS BEEN PREPARED AND ISSUED BY INSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL PURPOSES ONLY. IF A CONTRACTOR IS TENDERING OR CONSTRUCTING USING THIS DRAWING, THEY DO SO AT THEIR OWN RISK.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE ARCHITECT'S SITE PLAN AS WELL AS THE LATEST ISSUANCE OF ALL PLANS, DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS AS PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT BY OTHER PARTIES AND CONSULTANTS.

COORDINATION NOTE



SITE PLAN INFORMATION PROVIDED BY:



47 Loweswater Ave.
Unionville, Ontario, L3R 7W8
napadesign@rogers.com
416 930-6337

Brian Awde Architect Inc.

628 Cummer Avenue North York
Ontario M2K 2M8
Tel: (416) 226-5183 Fax: (416) 226-3266
e-mail: brianawde@sympatico.ca

ALL WORK SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LATEST REVISION OF THE ONTARIO BUILDING CODE AND ANY OTHER AUTHORITY HAVING JURISDICTION. ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED AND VERIFIED AT THE SITE BY EACH CONTRACTOR. ANY DISCREPANCIES AND/OR ERRORS SHALL BE REPORTED IN WRITING TO THE CONSULTANT BEFORE COMMENCING ANY WORK. ALL DRAWINGS ARE THE COPYRIGHT OF THE CONSULTANT AND REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT.

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF INSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC. AND MAY NOT BE COPIED IN WHOLE OR PART, NOR MAY ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREON BE USED WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION OF INSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.

LEGEND

- EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN REFER TO ARBORIST REPORT
- PROPOSED DECIDUOUS TREES
- PROPOSED SHRUBS AND PERENNIALS


PLANT LIST

KEY	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	COND.	CAL.	HT./SPR.	REMARKS	QTY.
A	QUERCUS MACROCARPA	BUR OAK	BB/WB	10MM		UNIFORM	1
B	SYRINGA RETICULATA "IVORY SILK"	IVORY SILK TREE LILAC	BB/WB	50MM		UNIFORM	1
a	HYDRANGEA ARBORESCENS "ABETWO"	INCREDIBALL SMOOTH HYDRANGEA	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	14
b	TAXUS MEDIA "FAIRVIEW"	FAIRVIEW YEW	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	4
c	ROSA RUGOSA "HANSA"	SHRUB ROSE	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	22
d	RIBES ALPINUM	ALPINE CURRANT	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	6
e	THUJA OCCIDENTALIS	EASTERN WHITE CEDAR	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	22
f	WIEGELA FLORIDA "ALEXANDRA"	WINE AND ROSES WIEGELA	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	15
g	HYDRANGEA PANICULATA "WIMS RED"	FIRE AND ICE HYDRANGEA	POT		60CM	EVENLY SPACED	10
h	HEMEROCALLIS PURPLE D'ORO	DAYLILLY	POT		1 GAL	EVENLY SPACED	20
i	ECHINEACEA	CONEFLOWER PINK DOUBLE DELIGHT	POT		1 GAL	EVENLY SPACED	22
j	RUDBECKIA	BLACK EYED SUSAN "SONATA"	POT		1 GAL	EVENLY SPACED	12
k	CALAMAGROSTIS ACUTIFLORA 'KARL FOERSTER'	FEATHER REED GRASS	POT		1 GAL	EVENLY SPACED	12


ALL TREE PITS, TRENCHES AND/OR PLANTING BEDS HAVE A TOPSOIL LAYER GREATER THAN 60cm WITH AN ORGANIC MATTER CONTENT OF 10% TO 15% BY DRY WEIGHT AND A PH OF 6.0-8.0. THE SUBSOIL HAS A TOTAL UNCOMPACTED SOIL DEPTH OF 90cm. THERE IS A MINIMUM SOIL VOLUME OF 30M³ PER TREE

SOIL NOTE

NTS





KEY PLAN



MAR28-19 REVISED AS PER NEW SITE PLAN LAYOUT ISSUED FOR CLIENT USE
APR4-17 REVISED AS PER PLANNER REQUEST ISSUED FOR CLIENT USE
MAR31-17 ISSUED FOR CLIENT USE

INSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE URBAN DESIGN MASTER PLANNING
TEL: (416) 545-1306 insite@globalserve.net



STAMPED FOR SPA ONLY

PROJECT:

7714 YONGE STREET
VAUGHAN ONTARIO
REGION FILE NUMBER:
SP-V-016-14

DRAWING:

LANDSCAPE PLAN

DATE: MAR30-17 PROJECT: 161205
SCALE: 1:200 SHEET: L-1

SURVEYOR'S REAL PROPERTY REPORT
PART 1
PLAN OF
LOT 59
REGISTRAR'S COMPILED PLAN N° 9834
(FORMERLY PART OF LOT 30 CONCESSION 1 WYS
TOWNSHIP OF VAUGHAN)

CITY OF VAUGHAN
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK
SCALE 1 : 150
2011



© R.G.McKIBBON LIMITED

PART 2
THIS PLAN MUST BE READ IN
CONJUNCTION WITH SURVEY REPORT
DATED : JULY 22, 2011

NOTES
Bearings shown hereon are astronomic and are referred to the
easterly limit of Part 1 as shown on Deposited Plan 64R-3520
having a bearing of N 09°30'00" W.

Survey Monuments Found shown thus

Survey Monuments Planted shown thus

SSIB - denotes Short Standard Iron Bar

SIB - denotes Standard Iron Bar

IB - denotes Iron Bar

IP - denotes Iron Pipe

O/U - denotes Origin Unknown

K - denotes V.Kremer Ltd. O.L.S. & Plan of
Survey, dated July 16, 1984

S - denotes C.A.Sexton Ltd. O.L.S.

P1 - denotes Deposited Plan 64R-3520

P2 - denotes Deposited Plan 64R-4057

P3 - denotes Deposited Plan 65R-4077

P4 - denotes Deposited Plan 65R-9240

P5 - denotes Deposited Plan 65R-18690

D - denotes Instrument N° VA 32690

MTO - denotes Ministry of Transportation of Ontario

R/W - denotes Retaining Wall

CLF - denotes Chain Link Fence

BF - denotes Board Fence

OW - denotes Overhead Wires

Br - denotes Brick

Fr - denotes Frame

Met - denotes Metal

Stu - denotes Stucco

Fdn - denotes Foundation

Ø - denotes Diameter

☼ - denotes Deciduous Tree

☼ - denotes Coniferous Tree

All Curb Elevations have been taken to Top of Curb

ELEVATION DATUM

Elevations are geodetic and are referred to City of Vaughan elevation datum

BENCH MARK : N° 1-3 ELEVATION : 174.950 m

Thornhill Public School at the west side of Yonge Street, approx. 483 m south

of Centre Street. Tablet set in north concrete foundation wall, 4.25 m from

northeast corner, 0.25 m below brick work.

Point at which elevations taken shown thus

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I CERTIFY THAT

1) This survey and plan are correct and in accordance with the Surveys Act,

the Land Titles Act and the Surveyors Act and the regulations made under them

2) The survey was completed on the 21st day of July 2011

July 22, 2011

Date

R.G. McKibbon

Ontario Land Surveyor

R. G. McKIBBON LIMITED

ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS

176 BULLOCK DRIVE, UNIT 10


MARKHAM, ONTARIO L3P 1W2

PHONE(905) 294-3754


FAX (905) 294-9400

email-r.g.mckibbon@rogers.com

THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED FOR
VALERIE HARLEY
SUSAN LORRAINE MORRISON
LYNDA ELLEN WARD
AND THE UNDERSIGNED ACCEPTS NO
RESPONSIBILITY FOR USE BY OTHER
PARTIES



CONVERSION NOTE :
DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN METRES AND
CAN BE CONVERTED TO FEET BY DIVIDING BY 0.3048



**ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO
LAND SURVEYORS**
PLAN SUBMISSION FORM
1814446
THIS PLAN IS NOT VALID
UNLESS IT IS AN EMBOSSED
ORIGINAL COPY
ISSUED BY THE SURVEYOR
In accordance with
Regulation 1026, Section 29(3)
FILE N° : H - 11 - 05



Google

April 20, 2021


Re: Renovation of existing heritage house, and rear addition At 7714 Yonge Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District

To the members of Heritage Vaughan Committee;

As stated within the March 24th, 2021 letter that we sent, The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT) is generally in favour of the application, and generally supports the staff recommendations, with some exceptions that have not been defined or addressed to our knowledge.

The site plan drawings submitted for the renovation of the original house at 7714 Yonge St. (p.295) suggest that the second floor structure is to be removed or partially-removed to be “open to above”. SPOHT strongly objects to the proposal to remove the second floor structure in the original house, **as this feature is vital to the historical fabric of this Built Heritage Asset** and the understanding of this building’s former function as a home, and such an action would limit future adaptive re-use, as well as partially destroy the integrity of the second story structure.

We ask also that the *external clapboard* fabric of the building be retained in order to maintain the original heritage surface patina and that repairs be carried out in order to stabilize the heritage boards vs. replacement.



Recent reports indicate that the building sign on the east facing surface of the new structure is in fact a window. We ask that this window be divided with 6 over 6 muntin bars.

Documentation of the rear timber frame former blacksmith shop: Austin A. Brilinger had opened a blacksmith shop behind his home in early 1928. We would like to see documentation created for the outbuilding prior to its demolition. This would define the prior use along with historical articles, the layout plan, structural design comment, size and scale, along with audit pictures that clearly shows materials used.

Finally, we were pleased to see that there is a plan to include an interpretive panel on the site. It would be great if this panel could be placed close to the Yonge St. frontage so that it is visible to those passing the property.

Sincerely,

Adam Birrell

President,
The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT)
416-985-1380
president@thornhillhistoric.org
www.thornhillhistoric.org

C5
Communication
Heritage Vaughan – April 21, 2021
Item # 1

Heritage Vaughan Committee
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Re: Renovation of existing heritage house, and rear addition at 7714 Yonge Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District

To the Committee Members of Heritage Vaughan

The removal of numerous large mature trees will alter the character of historic Thornhill and diminish the tree canopy as well as the vegetation screening for the abutting neighbours. Section 9.7.1 of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan states “Suitable new planting and management of existing flora are a primary means of ensuring the health of the entire ecosystem: plants contribute to stormwater and groundwater management, erosion control, and provide habitat and nutrition for wild fauna.” It would be beneficial for the applicant to plant as many trees and shrubs as possible on site. The remainder should be planted within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

Since the building sign on the east facing surface of the new structure is a very visible window from Yonge Street, it should be divided with 6 over 6 muntin bars.

The suggestion to install of a white picket fence, as previously referenced to in the archival photo, would enhance the Yonge Street streetscape for all to enjoy. While I understand it is not a requirement, it would be a nice goodwill gesture towards being a part of our community.

Sincerely,

Valerie Burke
Thornhill Resident

7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

RENOVATION OF EXISTING HERITAGE HOUSE, AND REAR
ADDITION AT 7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE
CONSERVATION DISTRICT

C6
Communication
Heritage Vaughan – April 21, 2021
Item # 1



Azam Khan, PhD
7716-7724 Yonge St.
(owner)

7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CONTENT

- Thanks to Alexander Planning for agreeing to the concrete barriers at the northwest and northeast ends of the existing driveway.
- Thanks for updated renders that no longer encroach over my property line.

CONCERNS

Trees

- Inconsistencies between the two arborist reports provided.
- Unconsented recommendations on shared trees in Amy Choi report.
- Inappropriate recommendations on trees that are fully on my property.

Design

- Massing very large and close to property line.
- Inaccurate drawing encroach over my property line.

Planning

- Electrical / Sewage concerns impacting my property and livelihood of my tenants.

7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CONTENT

- Thanks to Alexander Planning for agreeing to the concrete barriers at the northwest and northeast ends of the existing driveway.
- Thanks for updated renders that no longer encroach over my property line.

CONCERNS

Trees


- Inconsistencies between the two arborist reports provided.
- Unconsented recommendations on shared trees in Amy Choi report.
- Inappropriate recommendations on trees that are fully on my property.

Design

- Massing very large and close to property line.

Planning

- Electrical / Sewage concerns impacting my property and livelihood of my tenants.



LOT 58

PART 5 PLAN 65R - 18690

N*
2 Storey
Brick & Tile Clad
Dwelling

14

15

17

18

16

1070 HIGH GLASS/

BICYCLE RACK

RAMP 8%
MAX SLOPE

MAIN FLOOR
60.3 M²
(649 SF)

LINK

8.8 M²
(95 SF)

2ND FLOOR
25.3 M²
(273 SF)

CAFE
PATIO

CAFE
(30 SEATS)

LANDSCAPING

LANDSCAPING

SIGN

YIELD
SIGN

AutoCAD SHX Text

Timber R/W

NEW PLANTER
& BRICK TO
MATCH
EXISTING

19

REMOVE
EXISTING

7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CONTENT

- Thanks to Alexander Planning for agreeing to the concrete barriers at the northwest and northeast ends of the existing driveway.
- Thanks for updated renders that no longer encroach over my property line.

CONCERNS

Trees

- Inconsistencies between the two arborist reports provided.
- Unconsented recommendations on shared trees in Amy Choi report.
- Inappropriate recommendations on trees that are fully on my property.

Design

- Massing very large and close to property line.

Planning

- Electrical / Sewage concerns impacting my property and livelihood of my tenants.

LOT 58

PART 5 PLAN 65R - 18690

PIN 03257 - 0586

180°32'45"

N74°33'05"E Link 47.37

Fence

1079 HIGH METAL RAILING

RAMP 8%
MAX SLOPE +175.60

PHARMACY ENTRY

MAIN FLOOR
60.3 M2
(649 SF)

2ND FLOOR
22.3 M2
(240 SF)

CAFE
(30 Seaters)
Frame Clad Dwelling

CAFE PATIO

SOFT LANDS (SOD)

LINK
8.8 M2
(95 SF)

175.95+
CONC PAD/
GARBAGE

YIELD SIGN

1500 BOLLARD

1500 BOLLARD

YIELD SIGN

GARBAGE ROOM
CORESLAB FLOOR/CEILING
FRESH AIR INTAKE AT EXTERIOR WALL
2 - 95 GALLON GARBAGE TOTES
2 - 95 GALLON RECYCLING TOTES
DIRECT ACCESS TO PAVED WALK

PROPOSED ADDITION

282.2 M2 (3038 SF) MAIN FLOOR
285.6 M2 (3074 SF) SECOND FLOOR
MAIN FLOOR ELEVATION 176.12

LANDSCAPING/
SNOW STORAGE

OFFICES &
PHARMACY
ENTRY

E OF EXISTING WOOD
TURE TO BE REMOVED

3400 7800

1500 BOLLARD

6000

6280

5050



ACCESSIBLE
VAN
TYPE A

9834

7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CONTENT

- Thanks to Alexander Planning for agreeing to the concrete barriers at the northwest and northeast ends of the existing driveway.
- Thanks for updated renders that no longer encroach over my property line.

CONCERNS

Trees

- Inconsistencies between the two arborist reports provided.
- Unconsented recommendations on shared trees in Amy Choi report.
- Inappropriate recommendations on trees that are fully on my property.

Design

- Massing very large and close to property line.

Planning

- Electrical / Sewage concerns impacting my property and livelihood of my tenants.



7714 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

LOT 58
PART 5 PLAN 65R - 18690

