

**Communication : C 5**  
**Committee of the Whole (1)**  
**February 7, 2023**  
**Agenda Item # 1**

**From:** Sandra Yeung Racco [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 6, 2023 11:56 AM  
**To:** Mayor and Members of Council <[MayorandMembersofCouncil@vaughan.ca](mailto:MayorandMembersofCouncil@vaughan.ca)>; Todd Coles <[Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca](mailto:Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca)>; Haiqing Xu <[Haiqing.Xu@vaughan.ca](mailto:Haiqing.Xu@vaughan.ca)>; Nick Spensieri <[Nick.Spensieri@vaughan.ca](mailto:Nick.Spensieri@vaughan.ca)>  
**Cc:** Anna Venturo <[Anna.Venturo@vaughan.ca](mailto:Anna.Venturo@vaughan.ca)>; Natalie McBoyle <[Natalie.McBoyle@vaughan.ca](mailto:Natalie.McBoyle@vaughan.ca)>; Enza Barbieri <[Enza.Barbieri@vaughan.ca](mailto:Enza.Barbieri@vaughan.ca)>; Anthony Tersigni <[Anthony.Tersigni@vaughan.ca](mailto:Anthony.Tersigni@vaughan.ca)>; Gina Ciampa <[Gina.Ciampa@vaughan.ca](mailto:Gina.Ciampa@vaughan.ca)>; Lucy Cardile <[Lucy.Cardile@vaughan.ca](mailto:Lucy.Cardile@vaughan.ca)>; Nancy Tamburini <[Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca](mailto:Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca)>; Cindy Furfaro <[Cindy.Furfaro@vaughan.ca](mailto:Cindy.Furfaro@vaughan.ca)>; Rebecca Battat <[Rebecca.Battat@vaughan.ca](mailto:Rebecca.Battat@vaughan.ca)>; Carol Birch <[Carol.Birch@vaughan.ca](mailto:Carol.Birch@vaughan.ca)>; Nancy Tuckett <[Nancy.Tuckett@vaughan.ca](mailto:Nancy.Tuckett@vaughan.ca)>; Mary Caputo <[Mary.Caputo@vaughan.ca](mailto:Mary.Caputo@vaughan.ca)>  
**Subject:** [External] RE: Deputation for Item 1, Committee of the Whole, February 7, 2023

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

**RE: 7818 Dufferin Inc.**  
**Official Plan Amendment File OP.21.004**  
**Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.21.006**  
**7818 Dufferin Street**  
**Vicinity of Dufferin Street and Centre Street**

I am submitting my comments as the Acting President of Brownridge Ratepayers' Association with regards to this application. I will be making my deputation on Tuesday, Feb. 7<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 pm.

Having reviewed the report in front of you today, I can tell you that my community is **disappointed** to see staff making a recommendation to Vaughan Council to endorse this application, in preparation for the Ontario Land Tribunal Hearing.

For the new Council members, let me provide you with a brief history.

The original Owner of this Subject Land submitted both a Zoning By-law Amendment and a Site Development application to permit service commercial development, including a 4-storey office building and 5 one-storey service commercial buildings on the Subject Lands. The applications were considered at the Committee of the Whole held back on June 2, 2015. Unfortunately, this Owner was not able to finalize the necessary approvals for the service commercial development.

Subsequently, a new owner (7818 Dufferin Inc.) purchased the Subject Lands on May 4, 2020 and submitted their current applications.

At the **June 14, 2021 Public Hearing** meeting, the applicant proposed:

1 34-storey and 1 **12-storey** mixed used buildings, along with 2 2-storey townhouse blocks with 361.87 m2 ground floor retail, comprising a FSI of 4.82, totalling 863 dwelling units.

At the Public Hearing meeting, number of deputations, comments and submissions were received, highlighting issues with traffic congestion, unreasonable height and density and the lack of green and amenity spaces.

Since that Public Hearing meeting, the applicant has made no attempt to meet with the community, including the Brownridge Ratepayers' Association but instead, like a lot of greedy developers, chose to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal on June 30, 2022. Brownridge Ratepayers' Association has since filed to be part of the hearing and was granted party status.

One of the critical parts of good planning is to listen and work with the community, the planners, the City and other stakeholders in hope of bringing a more compatible and viable project to the neighbourhood. Unfortunately, this has not happened and from our experience, most likely won't, just by looking at what is being proposed here today.

The applicant amended the previous submission to:

1 **22-storey** and 1 **27-storey** mixed used building on top of a 7 – 10 storey podium, along with 2 blocks of townhomes totalling 10 units, a 311.19 m2 ground floor retail, 710.32 m2 public/private open space and 1401.09 m2 of public park/urban square, with a grand total of 863 units, with a FSI of 5.2.

To someone who is not paying attention or does not have a clear understanding, they may think this is a better proposal since they amended their application to lower their 34 storey to 27, however if you look at it in more details, you will realize that the 27 storey and the new 22 storey are actually sitting on a 7 to 8 storey podium, which when you add them up, goes back to the original 34 storey height. So what has changed? Is the applicant trying to pull a wool over our eyes? And furthermore, not only did they not attempt to bring down the unit numbers by staying at exactly same units as before, but now the Floor Space Index went from the original 4.82 to 5.2.

Insufficient parking was also identified as one of the issues from the previous Public Hearing meeting, however the applicant still have not provided the required parking for this development. Instead of providing:

Residential	1,295	<b>Total of 1,533 spaces</b>
Visitor	216	
Commercial	22	



a difference of 662 spaces

the applicant is only proposing:

Residential	691	<b>Total of 871 spaces</b>
Visitor	173	
Commercial	7	

This is unacceptable. Where will the overflow of cars be parking? With only 7 spaces for commercial and 173 visitor spaces, it will not be enough to serve the visitors of the condo, plus all those accessing the commercial/retails. Please don't tell me that people living here and those coming here will only be travelling by foot, bike and transit. Transportation staff needs to stop looking at numbers that they dreamed of but rather look at **realistic numbers**. Anyone sitting at this intersection can tell you that the ridership on our public transportation is dismally low. We live in a car-centric neighbourhood and to expect residents to be using transit and getting out of cars, but in my opinion, is only a pie in the sky. Maybe this may happen in another 20 years down the road but for this current timeline, not realistic.

This intersection is already congested because this intersection is where most commercial and residential traffic use to get access to Hwy. 7 from Dufferin St. The added cars from this and the previously approved development to the north will certainly add even more to this stable low-rise community. Planners and engineers need to look at what is taking place now and not a bunch of numbers someone at some desks put together. **No one is opposing to development but development needs to make sense and will not negatively impact on existing community, which this one definitely will.**

Our community would also like to know what is being proposed in the podium? Depending what is the usage for the proposed 7 – 10 storey of podium spaces, it will determine how busy this NW corner will become.

At the most recent OLT decision for the northern parcel of land at 7850 Dufferin St. (Dufcen Construction Inc.), it was approved with a **maximum of 12 storeys** only and a **maximum density of 2.84 FSI**. As well, there are a number of HOLDING clauses in place which we expect them to be implemented with this development, especially since this development will need access over 7850 Dufferin St. in order it can be viable, including **gaining full movement access at Dufferin St. and Beverly Glen Blvd**. This full movement access must be imposed with this application since currently, it has only 2 access points, both of which are right-in and right-out. If there are no proper access points, the transportation along this corner will be disastrous.

In conclusion, there are still many issues that have not been resolved to the satisfaction to alleviate the real concerns raised by the community. We are hoping that the applicant will be a responsible and reasonable neighbour and do what is right to make our neighbourhood more compatible and complete. **So I implore Council to not endorse the recommendations made by staff but to ask applicant to work with community and staff to address all the shortcomings or to refuse the current application as it stands.**

Thank you for an opportunity to address Council and City staff.

*Sandra Yeung Racco*, B. Mus.Ed., A.R.C.T.  
楊士淳

President & C.E.O., RACCO & Associates  
Founding President, Empowering YouR Vision  
Former Councillor, City of Vaughan

*“We don’t need a title to lead. We just need to care. People would rather follow a leader with a heart than a leader with a title.”*