

**Communication : C 22  
Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting)  
May 30, 2022  
Agenda Item # 4**

---

**From:** Genny Iori [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 9:09 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Gino Muia [REDACTED] Glen Shields Rate Payers  
<glenshieldsratepayers@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** [External] Re Owners / consultants, Public meeting of May 25 th for OP>21.030 and Z.21.058

Dear Mr Coles

I am one of the original residents of the Glen Shields community and would like the opportunity to voice my concerns on what transpired last night at this meeting.

The allocated meeting room was for 40 only people, where over 200 showed / attended, ( stopped counting at 200 ). There was no movement on the part of the presentation team there, to provide information on this project, / to find a new suitable meeting room or even start the meeting. After about a hour our counsellor Mr Shefman arranged to use the hockey rink. Lots of space but a very poor venue, acoustic problems, and no little sense of decorum.

There were several apologies made by the applicant's main speaker regarding the size of the meeting, repeatedly saying the they were not able to find any other larger meeting room in our area. All were booked for the next 3 months. On returning home to my surprise I was able to book the gym at the Duffern/ Clark community centre in the 7 Pm time slot, one week ahead .

One of the gentlemen at the meeting was introduced as the owners respective, it was not long that he stated he was the owner. A small issue I agree but what is the problem in being up front?

To one side we were told that our group was full of arrogant / ignorant people. I heard this myself and was also heard by a number of other rate payers at this meeting.

On the subject of included site amenities, the common area cafeteria for the retirement tower would also be open to the community to enjoy meals . It is unlikely that any of these gentlemen had ever visited such cafeterias, My experience suggests there are always some sleeping head first in their meals and a prevalent odour of urine . Not a place one would wish to have lunch

Regarding the proposed grocery store, when asked if they had any offers or had approached prospective companies to take up this space, they only looked at each other in confusion. Such a store will surely fail even if they could manage a tenant. Lobe has closed its doors many years back and the local Highland Farms is close to closing. There is no street level parking proposed here. Shoppers are reluctant to use under ground parking. Example the Plaza at Rutherford and Bathurst on the north side. Even in the rain

and snow the underground parking is seldom used. The same could be said for the day care and drug store if in fact they return after 2 or 3 years

There was some debate amongst the representative if there was an activity room for teenagers of the residential tower. In the end it was the opinion that this could be a shared room.

They often repeated that the residential apartments were intended for families, to blend in with the local neighbourhood. Then we learned, by far the largest number of apartments are one bedroom at about 530 sq feet. This is far too small for any family, rather likely for single men/women or university students.

I would also like to point out, the condition of the current shopping plaza. It has been in need of repairs /maintenance for years. Can we expect a marked improvement in the maintenance of this new development should it be allowed to move forward.

One of the presentation team came out and admitted (after many denials) that this presentation was only given to satisfy a planning dept requirement. Also, that the affordable rental units are being subsidized by CHMC?

That it didn't really matter if the project was approved locally as they would make their case with the OMB

There seems to be a serious credibility issue with this team. Not a good first impression on our residents. Can they be trusted going forward?

Regards Andrew Iori