

Britto, John

C	5
COMMUNICATION	
CW -	JUNE 5/18
ITEM -	5.42

From: DiGirolamo, Diana
Sent: Friday, June 1, 2018 3:58 PM
To: Britto, John
Subject: FW: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)
Attachments: Letter to Council - Pine Valley Enclave II.pdf

Communication for Pine Valley Enclave II (Files Z.16.038, DA.16.046 and 19CDM-16V006) – to be considered as the Committee of the Whole on June 5, 2018.

This communication relates only to the attached letter. The below comments were captured as part of the CW(PH).

Best regards,

Diana DiGirolamo
Planner

905-832-8585 ext. 8860 | diana.digirolamo@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | Development Planning Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1
vaughan.ca



From: Tania Lamanna [mailto:tlamanna@vaughan.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 3:43 PM
To: DiGirolamo, Diana <Diana.DiGirolamo@vaughan.ca>
Subject: Re: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)

Thank you Diana for all your assistance in explaining the by-laws to me. It is most appreciated and I'm very grateful for the assistance as I came into this with no knowledge of policy planning and by-law and I found it to be very overwhelming. You helped a citizen of this community understand the information in a very objective way.

Thank you again. I've attached my questions/comments to this email.

Best regards to you,

Tania

From: DiGirolamo, Diana <Diana.DiGirolamo@vaughan.ca>
Sent: October 27, 2016 1:34 PM
To: 'Tania Lamanna'
Subject: RE: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)

Thank you Tania. Your comments will be forwarded to our Clerks Department for inclusion into the public record for the Council Public Hearing on the subject development applications.

Best regards,

Diana DiGirolamo

Planner

905-832-8585 ext. 8860 | diana.digirolamo@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | Development Planning Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

vaughan.ca



From: Tania Lamanna [<mailto:>]
Sent: October-27-16 1:14 PM
To: DiGirolamo, Diana
Subject: Re: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)

Hello Diana,

Thank you for the email. I'm sending you this request as per our conversation.

There are a number of mature trees that line the lots behind the house on Pine Grove Rd. There are also several large trees that line the lots within the development in question. I am asking that these trees not be cut down for this development. The trees have been there for more than 30 years and provide a home to numerous wildlife species as well as privacy which is something this community has had and cherished for decades. I don't understand why a lonely developer comes along and suddenly can wipe out these trees with only a mere obligation to replant a little tiny tree in its place.

This community has lost everything because of Chris Zeppa and City Park Homes and they very least the city can do in our defense is leave the trees as they are. There is absolutely no reason why they should go.

I will be taking this forward to other individuals and will escalate if needed. I appreciate that your hands are tied to whatever council decides but I do hope that you can influence them in this regard. If not rest assured, I'll be influencing their election campaigns come voting season.

Thank you kindly for your assistance with this,

Tania Lamanna

From: DiGirolamo, Diana <Diana.DiGirolamo@vaughan.ca>
Sent: October 25, 2016 11:04 AM
To:
Subject: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)

Hi Tania,

Further to our conversation from earlier today, please find attached a copy of the Site Plan that was submitted with the development applications for Pine Valley Enclaves II (Files Z.16.038, DA.16.046 and 19CDM-16V006).

As discussed, it appears that 19 Pine Grove Road will be abutting the proposed Open Space Buffer, and a private backyard.



Best regards,

Diana DiGirolamo

Planner

905-832-8585 ext. 8860 | diana.digirolamo@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | Development Planning Department

2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

vaughan.ca



This e-mail, including any attachment(s), may be confidential and is intended solely for the attention and information of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify me immediately by return e-mail and permanently delete the original transmission from your computer, including any attachment(s). Any unauthorized distribution, disclosure or copying of this message and attachment(s) by anyone other than the recipient is strictly prohibited.

To: Members of Council

February 8th, 2017

Re: Re: Pine Valley Enclaves II (Z.16.038, DA.16.046, 19CDM-16V006)
Committee of the Whole Hearing – February 7th, 2017

I attended the Committee of a the Whole Public hearing on February 7th, 2017 and I spoke in regards to item #1 regarding the proposed townhouse development, Pine Valley Enclave II. I had 5 minutes to speak and that didn't allow me time to address certain items of concern regarding this proposal and specifically Mr. Zipay.

1. I applaud Councillor Iafrate's response to the notion that the "Plan to Grow" project initiated by the province is the sole reason for the level of townhouse and condo development going on in existing, mature neighbourhoods. She took the words right out of my mouth, that Council has the power to determine how and where it will intensify and they should be doing so while respecting and reinforcing the existing neighbourhoods and the existing citizens who reside there. What this means is that they can easily approve 14, 2-storey semis and fit the mandate of intensification without overdeveloping the area. That is not part of the mandate of Plan to Grow
2. Mr. Zipay made a notion that the lot setbacks and allotment were below minimum standards due the fact that with infill developments, you have to sometimes reduce these items to make them fit. I would accept this answer for the items that are reduced by 0.5m maybe but the minimum lot area required is 230 square meters and the proposal is for a minimum lot area of 108 square meters. That is less than half. If you can't provide the minimums or at the very least, closest to the minimum, then that means you have too many units for the area and you need to reduce.
3. Mr. Zipay did not address the comment on whether the trees were taken down without a permit nor did anyone from council ask about it. Were the trees removed lawfully? How many trees exactly were removed and has this been confirmed by the Forestry department? Was any regard given to the photographs provided by a community resident? Why did the city allow this action to happen and why is he not being reprimanded for taking such unnecessary and evasive steps towards a development that hasn't even been approved. If City Park homes was open to developing within and with the community, he would have at least spoken to us first and tried to meet us halfway. He could have tried to work around the trees or at least waited to see what could be done before destroying them but his actions show a complete disregard for the community members who have been here for 40 years. To the Councillor Iafrate's point, you can't just come in and impose on the existing community negatively.
4. Mr. Zipay also did not respond to the speaker who asked about the traffic report. Has this been conducted? I have a concern about the traffic on Pine Valley in terms of traffic going northbound, making a left into the area. Pine Valley has seen increased traffic over the years (despite the Provincial government's push towards transit on this road apparently) and now we have cars making left turns at two different points less than 20m from each other from a live

lane. This left lane already sees increased traffic due to the backlog of cars making the left onto Langstaff. Now there will be traffic forced into the intersection of Pine Valley and Willis Road as a result of cars making lefts just north of a traffic light. A similar example of this conflict is on Major Mackenzie just before Keele St where all the plazas sit on the north side. The left lane of traffic is always halted due the number of driveways and cars turning left at various points. The one difference on Major Mack is that there is no intersection to impede whereas at Pine Valley and Willis there is.

5. No members of council asked about the issue of townhouses being more than 3 stories due to grading. If the grading is going to force the units to stand at 4 stories tall, then the builder should be incorporating this into the design and make the units shorter.
6. Mr. Zipay did not address the remark of the houses already being "sold" prior to the application being permitted. A resident called the sales office and was told that they are all sold except for a corner lot. Isn't this practice illegal? Why do we support this?
7. I disagree with Mr. Zipay's assertion that the VOP 2010 is not the sole cause of this unrest in this community. The hearing was a testament to the fact that community members are angry about the volume and type of infill development being proposed and accepted. They have been speaking about it for years and there's been articles published about it and surely there have been numerous hearings before the one yesterday where the same frustration has been expressed. The message is pretty clear – it's not the infill per se, it's the type and volume. Like I said, had the builder come through with a scaled down, low rise option, the residents likely wouldn't have an issue because it would actually respect and reinforce the neighbourhood.
8. Have environmental reports been produced and have they been shared with the Community?
9. I challenge the notion that certain members of council don't have a conflict of interest with this application. I say this with respect and not with the notion that "councillors pockets are lined with developer's money" as one person said disrespectfully during the hearing. However, facts are facts and according to a Vaughan citizen article, Toronto Star article and Global News report, City Park homes holds \$1000 a plate fundraisers for Vita Nova which is a charity that Councillor Carella's wife is the Executive Director for. How can Mr. Carella be allowed to make planning decisions with respect to this developer when his wife's endeavors benefit directly from them?

Stemming from this concern, it showed in the report that during the first phase of Pine Valley Enclaves, the developer entered into a "settlement offer" with Council and in exchange, no report was developed by city planners to produce at council meetings and no evidence was submitted to challenge the development at the OMB hearing. This makes sense now why at the OMB hearing, the residents could not understand why city planners were not present to speak or challenge certain elements of the proposal nor did the city's lawyer say anything to challenge the proposal. My understanding was the city planners did not support aspects of the proposed

development and therefore they would have been crucial at this hearing to speak to what they opposed. However the residents were left alone. Not one person represented the city on this matter at the hearing. I have tried to get information on this settlement but it is private as it was agreed to during a closed door meeting of council. How is this permitted and how is Mr. Carella permitted to vote on such actions, in a closed door meeting to boot? Wouldn't it serve his best interests to vote in favour of this developer? I'm very confused as to how this is ok.

Now I digress from my respectful tone when I say this whole thing reeks of suspicion. At the hearing, all councillors seemed very against the developer and architect of the Major Mack and Prince Rupert development. Everyone was quite vocal about the issues and challenged the developer at every point they made, however the same did not quite happen for City Park homes? Outside of Mr. Rosati and Ms. Iafrate voicing their discontent with this application in its current form, there wasn't much else and yet the developments are very similar. I find this to be suspicious as I know ACE Developments are not big players but City Park Homes has some big backers. I don't want to draw conclusions however it's only natural for one to make these assumptions in absence of a similar reaction or action.

10. I also reject the notion from Mr. Zipay that we should "watch what we wish for" as I see this directly as an intimidation tactic. To say that we shouldn't fight the townhouses because we could instead get stacked townhouses or worse, a condo, is likened to say "women shouldn't complain about not having equal pay. It could be worse, they could not have a job at all so be careful what you wish for." The whole notion is absurd and strangely enough, Councillor Carella gave me the same argument when I called him to voice my concern about the development.
11. I challenge Mr. Zipay in his statement about how lot sizes have changed over the years. He's correct in that they have gotten smaller but at least that is designated for new areas where everything is the same, not in established areas. Established areas should try and retain the same look where possible. Also just because there is a trend of reducing lot size, doesn't make it right in all instances. Let's look to the houses in the Rutherford and Weston Rd area that were built on 80' deep lots. That practice stopped because it got to a point where it was ridiculous that detached houses were being built on such small lot sizes. The same can hold true for excessive infill development.

I would like these comments to be included with the Public Hearing minutes. It's not quite fair that residents only get 5 minutes but the developer gets to take all the time they want. I hope that Council will take this matter seriously and act in the best interests of their community members.

Sincerely,

Tania Lamanna