

From: Len and Lore Kozachuk
c/o [REDACTED]

April 4, 2022

To: Mayor and Members of Council
c/o clerks@Vaughan.ca

Cc: Jennifer.Kim@Vaughan.ca

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

RE: 2708971 ONTARIO INC. OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILE OP.21.025 ZONING BY-LAW
AMENDMENT FILE Z.21.053 - 9650 HIGHWAY 27 VICINITY OF HIGHWAY 27 AND MAJOR
MACKENZIE DRIVE WEST

We have been residents of Vaughan for over 20 years. Len's background is in transportation planning/environmental assessments, and he has run many public consultation programs where local residents and municipal councils did not support the plans proposed by the province or Region for new transportation corridors or improvements. We are accustomed to objectively considering both sides - the benefits and impacts - of a proposal, and how its potential direct impacts to a community may be outweighed by the longer-term benefits to the broader region. However, in reviewing the proposal for 9650 Highway 27 ("the Proposal"), we feel compelled to write in and express our views: we are strongly opposed to the Proposal; further, we are insulted by the ignorance and arrogance represented by this Proposal.

The ignorance is reflected in the proposed siting of this substantial project in a designated Natural Area, which is clearly neither intended for, nor consistent with, such development. The Proposal demonstrates a complete disregard for the protection of this Natural Area. The opening paragraphs of our municipal Official Plan (OP) (2010) cites the "significant loss of Natural Areas" as a "significant issue that Vaughanmust begin to address". Our OP also identifies that "[n]ot only are the Natural Areas key features on the landscape but they also contribute to the overall environmental health of the City and wider region: they form part of the larger Regional Greenlands system that ultimately extends south through Toronto to Lake Ontario. The Urban Structure identifies these areas and is **designed to protect them** in a manner that allows them to continue to provide vital ecosystem functions." Under the City's Official Plan, "Natural Areas and Countryside **shall be protected** and their ecological **functions preserved**" (emphasis added).

At the Regional level, the site is designated as Regional Greenland System in the Regional OP (2010). As per Section 2.1.9 of the Regional OP, development and site alteration **are prohibited** within the Regional Greenlands System. According to the proponent's own EIS, the Proposal will "result in the loss of areas of forest and woodland natural areas"; "the majority of the communities are natural", and "are connected to adjacent natural features to the south and west, mainly across the Humber River."

As residents of Sonoma Heights, ones who highly value and make use of the nature trails in the Elder's Mills Nature Reserve, we are concerned about further pressures upon and the loss of Natural Areas upriver of the reserve, and potential long-term effects on the function and viability of the Natural Areas in this section of the Humber River valley.

The arrogance of the Proposal is evident in the mind-boggling scale and design of the proposal itself, which gives no consideration to the context of the current site and completely undermines most of the City's OP Objectives:

- Proposing development in a designated natural area (violating objective 2.1.3.2.a);
- Proposing multi-story residential development outside of designated Intensification Areas (violating objective 2.1.3.2.c);
- Proposing a significant alteration to the character of the community in this area (violating objective 2.1.3.2.e);
- Proposing a multi-story residential development on a site outside of an established Community Area, and which can not be easily served by transit, nor is it located within reasonable walking or cycling distances to schools, retail areas/services, etc. (violating objective 2.1.3.2.f);
- Proposing a development that is not in keeping with design excellence and providing for the high quality public realm, as evidenced by the long list of proposed exceptions to their own proposed Zoning (RA3) requirements, as identified by City staff in the Committee of the Whole Report (violating objective 2.1.3.2.k);
- Directly impacting the sustainability of natural features and ecological functions (violating objective 2.1.3.2.l); and
- Creating a new barrier in an existing natural area, thereby disturbing a linked system (violating objective 2.1.3.2.m).

Vaughan does need denser residential development – including multi-story residential development like this - but in the appropriate locations. The Vaughan OP guides developers (and everyone else) where such development makes sense and can be more readily accommodated. Situating substantive, multi-story residential development in our Natural Areas is not the way to address intensification.

In light of the ignorance and arrogance demonstrated in the Proposal, we implore Vaughan council to send a strong signal to the development community: that protecting Natural Areas matters, zoning matters; planning matters; and the Vaughan OP matters; and **reject** the Proposal outright in no uncertain terms. Otherwise, others will point to this project as a precedent to run roughshod over our other Natural Areas, and thereby neuter the Vaughan OP and the extensive thought and consultation that went in to developing the City's plan for managing growth and providing a livable, sustainable community.

In summary, we are strongly opposed to the Proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Len and Lore Kozachuk
[REDACTED] Napa Valley Avenue

Woodbridge, Ontario