

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Adelina Bellisario](mailto:Adelina.Bellisario)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] fil OP.21.024/Z.21.048 - 8940 Bathurst  
**Date:** February-28-22 3:06:28 PM

---

---

**From:** Gabay, Maurice [REDACTED] >

**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 12:05 PM

**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca; Maurizio Bevilacqua

<Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Mario Ferri <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Gino Rosati

<Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Linda Jackson <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; Marilyn lafrate

<Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Tony Carella <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>;

rosanna.Defrancesa@vaughan.ca; Sandra Yeung Racco <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Alan Shefman

<Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>

**Subject:** [External] fil OP.21.024/Z.21.048 - 8940 Bathurst

Dear council,

My name is Maurice Gabay, and I live at [REDACTED] Serene Way [REDACTED]). Our house is only one block away for the proposed development at 8940 Bathurst St.

I understand that this proposal will be discussed at the council meeting on March 1<sup>st</sup> and the developer is requesting an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for consideration. It seems like only yesterday, the community fought against a neighboring proposal from the Islamic Shia Ithna-Asheri Jamaat of Toronto (9000 Bathurst ST). While, that proposal was appealed to the OMB, the outrage from the community, and the support from council was obvious. As outrages as that proposal was, this proposal is even worse!

I'm sure as you go through your deliberations, you and your staff will find a number of problems. I will not go into depth on all of them, but I would like to highlight a few of the ones that are of most concern.

The first is the density. They are proposing 708 units on 2 high rise buildings and 5 townhouse blocks – on a space of land that is only 4 acres! This level of density is unheard of in this area. This is twice the number of unit in the 9000 Bathurst st proposal, on a fraction of the space. Of course, this comes with a number of concessions which are totally unacceptable to the residents of this community and should be unacceptable to city council. For one, the height of

the proposed buildings is significantly higher than the 9000 Bathurst and the footprint is smaller.

In addition there is less parking on the proposal. Council has already heard how parking along Ner Isreal is currently a concern. When the proposal for 9000 Bathurst St was discussed we provided evidence of parking issues into the community – and that was before their planned community. Their proposal, at least tried to address this issue. They have amended their proposal to include 1,292 parking spaces for 343 residential units. This proposal fails in comparison – having only 710 parking spots for 708 units. This works out to 0.8 spaces per unit and only 0.2 spaces for visitors. While I'm sure the developer will argue that the residents (and their visitors) will rely on public transit, this has not been the experience in this community and I'm sure throughout much of the region. In an area where parking is already an issue, this will only make it worse.

Another major concern is the amount of added traffic into the neighborhood. While this building is “on Bathurst”, there is no exit onto Bathurst st for vehicles. There are 2 vehicle entrances onto Ner Isreal Drive. This obviously means more traffic onto that street. When combined with the increased traffic from the 9000 Bathurst st development (also with their major entrance on Ner Israel Dr., this will make the situation untenable. Given this, and the Tridel development across the street, this will make the traffic along Bathurst st a bottleneck – forcing traffic into the community streets. We already have narrow streets in our block, with many streets (including mine) not having any sidewalks. This means people walking must walk on the roads. During school hours, which happened to be high traffic hours, this means children walking on the narrow roads with increased traffic. This is a recipe for disaster – especially given that we already had one fatality on Pleasant Ridge involving a 10 year old girl in the fall of 2021. People are already using these streets to avoid traffic along Bathurst and Dufferin – don't make it worse.

As noted, in the proposal, the development group did meet with a representative from the Preserve Thornhill Woods ratepayers Association (PTWA) to discuss the proposal. What they failed to mention, is the initial proposal that was reviewed was not as large as the one being submitted. They obviously had no intention on listening to any of the community concerns. What they have submitted is a proposal that they know will be objected to, so when they come back to council, or appeal to the OMB, they can come back

with their original plan and seem "reasonable". The council and city staff do not have time for such games, and should outright reject this proposal and ask the developers to come back with something more reasonable for consideration.

Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Regards,

Maurice Gabay