

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (1) – OCTOBER 5, 2021****COMMUNICATIONS****Distributed October 1, 2021**

	<b><u>Item No.</u></b>
C1. Mr. Tony Zuccaro, President, Carrying Place & Sonoma Rate Payers Association, dated September 29, 2021	2
C2. Renata Cipriani, Sonoma Heights, dated September 29, 2021	2
C3. Mr. Joe Basile, Sonoma Heights resident, dated September 30, 2021	2
C4. Memorandum from the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, dated September 27, 2021	6
C5. Presentation material entitled " <i>The Burwick Residences, 4-24 Lansdowne Ave, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment</i> "	1

**Distributed October 4, 2021**

C6. Memorandum from the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, dated October 5, 2021	3
C7. Ms. Rosemarie L. Humphries, President, Humphries Planning Group Inc., Pippin Road, Vaughan, dated October 4, 2021	1
C8. Mr. John Mora, Chalone Circle, Woodbridge, dated October 4, 2021	2
C9. Mr. Robert Piecuch, Chalone Circle, Woodbridge, dated October 4, 2021	2

**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.**

**Communication : C1**  
**Committee of the Whole (1)**  
**October 5, 2021**  
**Agenda Item # 2**

---

**From:** CPRA <carryingplaceratepayers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:01 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Tony Carella <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; Rebecca Roach <Rebecca.Roach@vaughan.ca>  
**Cc:** Domenic Scaturchio [REDACTED]; Lucy Frechette [REDACTED]; R C [REDACTED]; Cpra <carryingplaceratepayers@gmail.com>; Lucy Cardile <Lucy.Cardile@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] OBJECTION RE: 9630 islington Ave RE: Request for Comment on City of Vaughan Development Applications Z.20.001 and DA.20.002

Hello Members of Council

Please find the Carrying Place and Sonoma rate Payers Association and community's objection to this development for several reason mentioned below.

- **Although this proposal is an idea under the VOP, it does not now take into consideration the current areas development and those developments studies.**
- The height of this 17.4 meters which converts to 57.08 feet. At 5 storeys this would average out to approx. 11.5 feet per storey. **So in reality it will look like a 7 storey building** at the traditional 8 feet per storey. This will be problematic for the homes adjacent to a building this high.
- **Shadow studies** are very much required as this is currently causing major concerns with adjacent residents. I will imagine that it will impact sunlight exposure on the nearby homes.
- The **one entrance just before Silver Oaks on Napa** ( highlighted in yellow) will also be problematic with the shopping plaza just across the street. It's a problem now. I can only imagine what it will be like when this is built.
- We do not believe that the traffic study considered the yet to be built new condos directly across the street and down the street at 9560 islington Ave.
  - Both traffic studies may now be based on **old data** that does not support the new reality.
  - We are requesting to have an updated traffic study which will take into consideration the following
    - The adjacent 9681 condo development
    - 9560 islington development – the lights will be used more frequently
    - Silver Oaks/ Napa Valley

- Psychological study as this would now cause stress among the residents adjacent – anxiety to sell the home at a proper assessed value of their home.
- Proposal has too many single dwelling apartments (69% SINGLE DWELLING)
- Would like to see a **Fire Department report** showing the safety in case of an emergency – no secondary emergency exit.
- No new road infrastructure is proposed.
- **Intense Lighting plan** which is already incomplete and not submitted as residents have requested to see the impact to their homes when lighting is required for safety concerns – crime prevention
- **Police report** showing prime prevention analysis on adding another proposal of this kind in such a small area
- **Request homes be evaluated before and after constructions starts and be reimbursed if there is any structural damage to their homes due to the vibration**
  - An example is that there were homes reviewed before the start of the Major Mackenzie construction why not here when its right in your backyard?
- If construction starts that it be started at 9am until 3pm when traffic is to a smaller number, no weekend construction
- Many non-compliant areas to fulfil – so why not just following the area requirements





Thank you

Tony Zuccaro, President

Carrying Place & Sanoma Rate Payers association

**From:** R C [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:13 PM  
**To:** Rebecca Roach <Rebecca.Roach@vaughan.ca>; Clerks@vaughan.ca; Tony Carella <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] OBJECTION RE: 9630 islington Ave RE: Request for Comment on City of Vaughan Development Applications Z.20.001 and DA.20.002

Dear Rebecca Roach, Tony Carella and to whom may concern,

I am a resident in Sonoma Heights and I am extremely upset at the proposed 5 storey building at 9630 Islington Ave. We have such a problem with **traffic congestion and noise** in our community that it is absurd that this building is even being considered. I strongly oppose any building in the Sonoma or Carrying Place areas. I do not approve of this!

Renata Cipriani  
Sonoma Heights

**From:** Joe Basile [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 30, 2021 6:51 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [External] 9630 Islington

I oppose this application.

What is the point of having bylaws when they can ask for exemptions to 50+?

The traffic congestion in the morning at Islington and Napa Valley is bad already.

Add to this another 100+ units and it will be a complete mess and safety hazard.

If the original plan called for townhouses, build the townhouses.

I welcome affordable housing, but ones that help the community and add to it.

Adding units with not enough parking is not contributing to anything than more issues.

I can only assume that there will be parking issues in the neighbouring plaza and streets. As well, 5 storeys + 2 levels of electrical would be an eyesore for everyone, but even moreso for the properties surrounding the subject land.

I repeat that I strongly oppose this project.

Joe Basile  
Sonoma Heights resident

**Communication : C 4**  
**Committee of the Whole (1)**  
**October 5, 2021**  
**Agenda Item # 6**

**DATE:** September 27, 2021

**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council

**FROM:** Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

**RE:** COMMUNICATION – Committee of the Whole (1), October 5, 2021  
Item No. 6, Report No. 43

**VAUGHAN METROPOLITAN CENTRE (VMC)  
PARKING PILOT BY-LAW AMENDMENTS**

---

**Recommendation**

4. THAT Parking By-law, 064-2019, as amended, be further amended to prohibit stopping on the west side of Millway Avenue from Portage Parkway to Applemill Road, in accordance with Attachment 5 of this Memorandum.

**Background**

As the City's first premium level of service streetscape, Millway Avenue between Regional Road 7 and Portage Parkway incorporates sustainable principles such as generous pedestrian zones and pathways, cycling facilities, as well as passenger pick-up/drop-off (PPUDO) area and urban boulevard landscape treatments. Millway Avenue is a major link to the transit facilities and serves as the social and cultural spine of Vaughan's downtown.

In 2017, prior to the opening of the VMC Subway Station, parking and stopping prohibition by-laws were introduced and approved by Council for the downtown core including Millway Avenue to ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic. Subsequently in 2019, the SmartVMC Bus Terminal was completed and opened for business. With the operations of both transit facilities, additional stopping restriction (no stopping anytime) is now recommended for a segment on the west side of Millway Avenue from Portage Parkway to Applemill Road in order to complete the missing links.

**Conclusion**

Policy Planning and Special Programs recommends that Council approve the additional parking by-law amendments in accordance with the recommendation of Attachment 5 of this Memorandum. The proposed stopping prohibition on Millway Avenue, adjacent to the SmartVMC Bus Terminal will facilitate the safe movement of all modes of travel including pedestrian, cycling, transit and vehicular traffic.

For more information, please contact Christina Bruce, Director, Policy Planning & Special Programs (ext. 8231) and Gus Michaels, Director, By-Law and Compliance, Office of the DCM, Community Services (ext. 8735).


**Attachment**

1. Attachment 5 - Millway Ave Parking By-law Amendments

**Prepared By**

Musa Deo, VMC Transportation Project Manager, ext. 8295  
Jennifer Cappola-Logullo, Manager, VMC Development Engineering, ext. 8433  
Rudi Czekalla-Martinez, Manager, Policy & Business Planning, ext. 8782

Respectfully submitted by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Haiqing Xu', with a stylized, cursive script.

Haiqing Xu,  
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management



***THE CITY OF VAUGHAN***

Attachment 5

***BY-LAW*****BY-LAW NUMBER - 2021**

**A By-law to amend the Consolidated Parking By-law 064-2019 as amended, to govern and control parking in the City of Vaughan.**

The Council of The Corporation of the City of Vaughan ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. THAT City of Vaughan By-law 064-2019 (Consolidated) as amended, be further amended as follows:

(a) Add the following road segments to **Schedule 3 – No Stopping**:

<b>Highway</b>	<b>Side</b>	<b>From and To</b>	<b>Prohibited Time of Day</b>
Millway Avenue	West	From the south limit of Portage Parkway to 164 metres north of Applemill Road	Anytime
Millway Avenue	West	From 27 metres north of Applemill Road to the south limit of Applemill Road	Anytime

Enacted by City of Vaughan Council this 20th day of October 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Todd Coles, City Clerk

Authorized by Item No. XX of Report No. YY  
of the Committee of the Whole (1) October 5, 2021  
Adopted by Vaughan City Council on  
October 20, 2021



THE  
**BURWICK**  
RESIDENCES

Communication : C5  
Committee of the Whole (1)  
October 5, 2021  
Agenda Item # 1




**MHBC**  
PLANNING  
URBAN DESIGN  
& LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

**4-24 LANSLOWNE AVE**

**OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT**  
**October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

# CURRENT SITE CONDITION



## Site Stats:

- Consist of 5 parcels;
- Currently vacant
- 3,040 sq. m (0.75 acres) in size;
- Site has two (2) street frontages:
  - Approx. 40 m frontage along HWY 7
  - Approx. 75 m frontage along Lansdowne Avenue

## Transportation:

- Within 500 m of Local and Regional bus stops:
  - VIVA Orange Line;
  - Brampton Zum 501 Line;
  - YRT 77 and 77A



# SURROUNDING CONTEXT



- Subject Lands
- Natural Areas
- Parks
- Private Open Spaces
- Low-Rise Residential
- Low-Rise Mixed Use
- Mid-Rise Residential
- Mid-Rise Mixed-Use
- Prestige Employment
- Lands Subject to Secondary Plan Area

- - - 400m Radius
- - - 800m Radius
- Commercial
- School
- Recreation Centre
- Park
- Library
- Transit Stop

- Community Centre
- Senior Residential
- Child Care Centre
- Emergency Services
- Place of Worship

# PREVIOUS PROPOSAL




- 12-storey Mixed Use Building;
- Floor Space Index of 4.94 times the lot area;
- Total Gross Floor Area of 13,145 sq. m.;
  - Non-residential GFA of 320 sq. m.;
  - Residential GFA of 12,825 sq. m.;
  - Contains 61 residential units.
- 93 parking spaces within a 2-level underground parking structure;
- 37 bicycle parking spaces;
- 554 sq. m of green space; and
- 4,165 sq. m of private amenity space.

# CURRENT PROPOSAL



- 12-storey Mixed Use Building;
- Floor Space Index of 5.1 times the lot area;
- Total Gross Floor Area of 13,360 sq. m.;
  - Non-residential GFA of 390 sq. m.;
  - Residential GFA of 13,260 sq. m.;
  - Contains 72 residential units.




- 166 parking spaces within a 3-level underground parking structure;
- 44 bicycle parking spaces;
- 1,215 sq. m of green space; and
- 3,750 sq. m of private amenity space.

# COMPARISON


	PREVIOUS PROPOSAL	CURRENT PROPOSAL
Number of Storeys	12-storeys	12-storeys
Floor Space Index	4.94 times the lot area	5.1 times the lot area
Gross Floor Area	13,145 sq. m. • 320 sq. m. commercial • 12,825 sq. m. residential	13,360 sq. m. • 390 sq. m. commercial • 13,260 sq. m. residential
Number of Units	61	72
Parking Spaces	93 spaces	166 spaces
Bicycle Parking Spaces	37 spaces	46 spaces
Green Space	554 sq. m.	1,215 sq. m.
Private Amenity	4,165 sq. m.	3,750 sq. m.



# SITE PLAN



# CONTEXT PLAN









THE  
**BURWICK**  
RESIDENCES

**diamond  
schmitt**



**MHBC**  
PLANNING  
URBAN DESIGN  
& LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

**THANK YOU**  
**ANY QUESTIONS?**



**Communication : C 6  
Committee of the Whole (1)  
October 5, 2021  
Agenda Item # 3**

**DATE:** October 5, 2021

**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council

**FROM:** Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

**RE:** COMMUNICATION - Committee Of The Whole (1), October 5, 2021  
Item # 3, Report # 43

**CAPLINK LIMITED  
ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.21.015  
SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.21.018  
WARD 2 - VICINITY OF HIGHWAY 50 AND LANGSTAFF ROAD**

---

## **Recommendations**

The Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management recommends:

That the staff report for Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.21.015 and Site Development File DA.21.018 (Caplink Limited) be amended as follows:

1. THAT the “Transportation and Road Network” section be deleted and replaced as follows:

**“Transportation and Road Network**

Three vehicular accesses are proposed to the Subject Lands including one on each of Highway 50, Langstaff Road and on the east side of the Subject Lands connecting with the Keyes Court extension. In support of the proposed Development, a Traffic Impact Study prepared by nexTrans dated June 30, 2021 and Site Plan by Baldassarra Architects dated July 12, 2021 were submitted. Transportation Engineering is satisfied with the overall findings of the report; however, the study requires approval by York Region. Furthermore, the Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan must be updated to reflect the Keyes Court extension as a public road instead of an access driveway should the lands to the east of the Subject Lands not be developed as a comprehensive campus-style development with the Subject Lands. Detailed engineering drawings would also be required for the proposed north-south portion of the future Keyes Court road extension at this time. A condition to this effect is included in Attachment 1.”

2. THAT Condition 1e) in Attachment 1 – “Conditions of Site Plan Approval” be deleted and replaced as follows:

- “1e) The Owner shall agree to design and construct the extent of the north to south road that may ultimately connect to the Keyes Court’s extension on the east side of Huntington Road to the satisfaction of the Development Engineering Department. The Owner will be required to submit the engineering drawings for review and approval by the Development Engineering Department;”
3. THAT Condition 2d) in Attachment 1 – “Conditions of Site Plan Approval” be deleted and replaced as follows:
- “2d) The proposed road shall be designed as per City of Vaughan standards as part of the Block 57/58 Transportation Master Plan. Currently, the proposed road shall act as an access driveway but shall be constructed as a public road that may be conveyed to the City in the future for the north to south road link that ties Langstaff Road to Keyes Court as part of the Block 57/58 Plan and the Transportation Master Plan, if the lands to the east is not developed in a campus style manner;”

## **Background**

The “Transportation and Road Network” section of the staff report for Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.21.015 and Site Development File DA.21.018 (Caplink Limited) requires the north-south road link located on the east limit of the Subject Lands to be constructed to municipal standards but can be used as an access driveway until the remaining public road right-of-way connecting to Huntington Road is constructed by the abutting landowner to the east.

Further clarification is being provided through this Communication that the north-south road link may be conveyed to the City and the connection to Huntington Road may be constructed should the lands to the east of the Subject Lands not be developed as a comprehensive campus style development with the Subject Lands. Accordingly, revisions to the staff report and conditions of site plan approval are included to reflect this intent.

For more information, contact, Frank Suppa, Director, Development Engineering ext. 8255.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Haiqing', with a stylized, flowing script.

Haiqing Xu  
Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

## HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.

FOUNDED IN 2003

October 4, 2021  
HPGI File: 20646

**Office of the City Clerk**  
**City of Vaughan**  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario  
L6A 1T1

**Re: Request for Notice**  
**Committee of the Whole (1) Meeting – October 5, 2021**  
**Item 1 – Avalee (Vaughan) Inc. – Official Plan Amendment File OP.19.007,**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.19.019, Site Development Application**  
**DA.19.069 - 2 Lansdowne Avenue**  
**City of Vaughan**

---

Humphries Planning Group Inc. (HPGI) received a courtesy Notice of Committee of the Whole Meeting for the proposed Official Plan (OP.19.007) and Zoning By-law Amendment (Z.19.019), and Site Development (DA.19.069) Applications for the development of the lands at 2 Lansdowne Avenue, in the City of Vaughan.

HPGI represents the owners of the lands located at 7803 Kipling Avenue, 15 Burwick Avenue and 40 & 36 Lansdowne Avenue in the City of Vaughan. A PAC Meeting was held with City of Vaughan Staff on July 23, 2021 (PAC.18.016), to discuss the development proposal associated with the subject lands and determine the required items to facilitate the development proposal. A Concept Block Plan was provided as part of our PAC Meeting on July 23, 2021, that is different from what is being shown on Figure 3 of the Staff Report (Attachment 1: Conceptual Block Plan). HPGI is writing to confirm that the Block Plan, as provided in the Staff Report for item 1 on the Agenda in Attachment 3, is not final for the entire block and can be modified through subsequent applications as they come forward.

In addition, as requested previously, please provide the implementing documents for the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the lands at 2 Lansdowne Avenue.


In addition, HPGI requests notice of all meetings and submissions as well as any Council decisions or other approval authorities associated with these applications and approval documents.



***Committee of the Whole (1) Meeting – October 5, 2021***  
***October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021***  
**Page 2 of 2**

Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at extension 244.


Yours truly,  
**HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'R' followed by a horizontal line and a loop.

Rosemarie L. Humphries BA, MCIP, RPP  
President

***Attachment:***

- 1. Conceptual Block Plan***



KEY PLAN 2/2  
NOT TO SCALE

Zoning By-Law Objection  
City of Vaughan File Planning Application File Number: Z.20.001  
9630 Islington Avenue.

I 'am writing this letter to the Vaughan City Councilors and my elected Ontario MPP regarding a planned 6 Storey condominium proposed to be built at 9630 Islington Ave. I have a suspicion that the developer already feels that this project will be pushed through because he had the audacity to put up sales advertising on August 30, 2021 five weeks before the Vaughan Municipal Committee of the Whole meeting was scheduled for October 05, 2021.

I want to remind the Councilors that other residents and I pay yearly property and provincial taxes. One of the services we pay for is the Zoning By-Law Code, Amendments and Code Enforcement in both the Municipality and the Province. As a taxpayer, I expect these By-Laws to be enforced on all building projects in Ontario and Vaughan; Zoning-By Laws are created and amended to provide Safety, Prevent Conflicts with Neighbors and provide a Clean Living Environment.

The developer is proposing the 6 Storey Condominium at 9630 Islington Ave. trying to put up an overpopulated building in a space a little bigger than 1 acre (4046 square meters) requiring extensive variances to the existing Vaughan Municipal Zoning-By Laws to accommodate their proposed 89 units. The developer is instructing the City of Vaughan that these Zoning By-Law changes are required to accommodate their need for maximum profit. I would like to remind the City of Vaughan that Property Tax Payers have paid for the Zoning By-Law Code and its Enforcement.

I also have several concerns with the proposed project, some of which are:

1. Traffic -The current roads will not accommodate the additional traffic that this and the other two six-story condos will create. No actual traffic study has been done to see what the real impact will be. All traffic studies were done during COVID when we all know most people were not working or working from home. This dramatically decreased traffic in the area when the study was conducted.
2. The number of units -In addition to the increase in units from the initially zoned for 28 units by Council in 1998, which could be built in accordance with Vaughan Zoning By-Laws, now it has jumped to 89 units and requires extensive Zoning By-Law variances to accommodate this building on this small property. I can foresee that the Zoning By-Law amendments the developer requires will create Safety Problems and lead to Conflicts in the surrounding neighbourhood.
3. Parking – we also see that accommodations have been made for the number of required parking spaces. The current proposal shows 50 parking spaces. The current city requirement is 1.5 spaces per dwelling, which is 133 required parking spaces, a reduction of 60% of the total parking spots. This seems like a substantial reduction; where does the city propose that all other residential cars and visitors park?
4. Entrance – the proposed shows only one entrance and exit for the Condo.. Also, given that there is only one entrance when the garbage truck arrives, it will need to back of the condos as there is no room for the truck to turn and leave facing forward. This will create a risk for anyone walking on the sidewalk who is not paying attention and cause a severe accident.

5. Green Space – there is also no green space allocated in this proposal. The entire property will be concrete and asphalt. With everything we have just gone through with COVID and the need for people to be outdoors in open areas, I am surprised that we are allowing this project to move forward with no green space for any of the children that may live in this Condo.
6. Noise – As a resident to which this property will back onto, I do not see any acoustic fencing in the proposal. It looks as if the developer plans to use the existing fencing as the acoustic barrier between the properties. The current fencing is not designed to be an acoustic barrier. It is also important to point out that our property line extends 6 inches past the bottom of the retaining wall. I will not allow the developer to take that 6 inches of property. The Acoustic fence needs to be erected on their property and be sufficient to eliminate noise coming from the property interfering with the enjoyment of our properties.

If the developer is allowed to push forward with this project in contradiction to the Vaughan Municipal Zoning-By Law, I think the City of Vaughan is choosing to risk public safety and conflict and should be held liable, should eliminate the Planning and Zoning Department to save taxpayers money, and offer taxpayers a refund for the time and investment wasted in the Zoning and Planning Departments.

Regards,

John Mora  
■ Chalone Cr.  
Woodbridge, Ontario  
■

## Zoning By-Law Objection

**City of Vaughan File Planning Application File Number: Z.20.001  
9630 Inslington Avenue.**

I 'am writing this letter to the Vaughan City Councilors and my elected Ontario MPP in regards to a planned 6 Storey condominium proposed to be built at 9630 Islington Ave. I have a suspicion that the developer already feels that this project will be pushed through, because he had the audacity to post sales advertising on August 30 2021 five weeks before the Vaughan Municipal Committee of the Whole meeting was scheduled October 05 2021.

I would like to remind the Councilors that I and other residents pay yearly property and provincial taxes and one of the services we pay for is the Zoning By-Law Code, Amendments and Code Enforcement in both the Municipality and the Province. As a taxpayer I expect these By-Laws to be enforced to all building projects in Ontario and Vaughan, **Zoning-By Laws are created and amended to provide Safety, Prevent Conflicts with Neighbors and provide a Clean Living Environment.**

The developer proposing the 6 Storey Condominium at 9630 Islington Ave. trying to put up an over populated building in a space a little bigger than 1 acre (4046 square meters) requiring extensive variances to the existing Vaughan Municipal Zoning-By Laws to accommodate their proposed 89 units. The developer is instructing City of Vaughan that they require these Zoning By-Law changes to accommodate their need of maximum profit, **I would like to remind City of Vaughan that Property Tax Payers have paid for the Zoning By-Law Code and its Enforcement.**

I 'am not against development but this property was originally zoned for 28 units by Council in 1998 which could be built in accordance with Vaughan Zoning By-Laws, now it has jumped to 89 units and requires extensive Zoning By-Law variances to accommodate this building on this small property. I can foresee the Zoning By-Law amendments the developer requires will create Safety Problems and will lead to Conflicts in the surrounding neighborhood.

If the developer is allowed to push forward with this project in contradiction to the Vaughan Municipal Zoning-By Law, I think the City of Vaughan is choosing to risk public safety and conflict and should be held liable, should eliminate the Planning and Zoning Department to save taxpayers money, and offer taxpayers a refund for the time and investment wasted in the Zoning and Planning Departments.

regards, Robert Piecuch  
[REDACTED] Chalone Cr.  
Woodbridge, Ontario  
[REDACTED]