

VAUGHANWOOD RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION  
52 FOREST CIRCLE COURT  
WOODBIDGE, ONTARIO L4L 1N9



July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Re; Consent Application B014/21  
160 Monsheen Drive  
Woodbridge, Ontario

The Vaughanwood Ratepayer's Association are in opposition to the above application.

The application is not addressing proper planning. It only disturbs the settled, mature and established community of Seneca Heights. This community is unique as it has significant historical, archaeological and architectural value. No severance has ever been granted in this area since 1954. Only one severance was proposed in 1998 and it was refused!

Severance of this application will start a chain reaction with the other lots in the area. The residents that support this application today may be coming in front of this committee for future severances. This would forever change the streetscape of Seneca Heights.

Vaughan Policy 9.1.2.3 (a) or (b) states that any severance must be compatible with the adjoining lots in terms of lot area to maintain the character of the existing large lot neighbourhoods. Proposed lots should have lot frontages **equal to or exceeding** frontages of adjoining lots. Proposed lots should be consistent in size. Please note lot 64 Tayok Drive and 150 Monsheen Drive which are the adjoining lots (and the **ONLY suitable** comparisons according to the updated version of Policy 9.1.2.3) are extensively larger than the proposed lots.

**64 Tayok Drive is 2,986.1m lot area with 32.1m frontage**  
**150 Monsheen Drive is 1611.9m lot area with a 30.5m lot frontage**  
**The proposed lot is 794m lot area with 23.7m and 22.4m lot frontage**

Therefore this fails to meet the criteria for consent to the existing lot according to Vaughan's policy. 9.1.2.3 (a) & (b). It is ludicrous/senseless to even entertain this application if we are to adhere to the VOP. The policy is meant to protect and preserve the integrity of large lot neighbourhoods.

Surrounding existing lots are extensively larger than the proposed severance. This severance does not blend in with the character of the existing neighbourhood and existing lots.

This application is not minor nor desirable in this unique community of Seneca Heights.

Absolutely no other pocket in Vaughan has the unique features and significant history of Seneca Heights. By allowing this severance to proceed, you will be eradicating part of Vaughan's History.

**Residents are raising doubts of the City staff's management of the process during this severance. It did not instill a sense of trust and accuracy.**

- **Planning recommending approval of an incomplete application (assessment should have been completed and submitted with the application after a pre-consult that would have clearly identified the need for an archaeological assessment)**
- **Placing the archaeology report condition in last minute**
- **Director of Planning report (revised memo Oct 28) using outdated language instead of the amended, current version from Policy 9.1.2.3 (a) & (b) from VOP**
- **COA not able to find past severance, it did not exist, unsupportive language used**

**These are glaring errors.**

The residents are not required to identify the errors/inconsistencies in City Staff's professionalism. The residents should not be advocating for policy that city staff should be well versed in. This is not *their* day job. They should not need to dig through policy on the internet and scramble to bring items to the

attention of city staff. This is unacceptable as they have busy lives, young families and day jobs.

This is not good planning. We are asking the committee to review the correct facts at hand and **to refuse the application.**