

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Assunta Ferrante](mailto:Assunta.Ferrante)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Comment on Zoning by-law amendment file Z.21.021 (June 4, 2024 meeting)  
**Date:** Monday, June 3, 2024 9:20:27 AM

---

**From:** Matthew Walton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 3, 2024 9:18 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Abby Vogus [REDACTED]; Casandra Krysko <Casandra.Krysko@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] Comment on Zoning by-law amendment file Z.21.021 (June 4, 2024 meeting)

**CAUTION!** This is an external email. Verify the sender's email address and carefully examine any links or attachments before clicking. If you believe this may be a phishing email, please use the Phish Alert Button.

Hello,

My name is Matthew Walton and I live at [REDACTED] Wallace St. I am writing to share some concerns and questions about the proposed development as part of file Z.21.021.

First, I am confused about how the demolition of the current residence at 56 Wallace St was approved by the Heritage Vaughan Committee in its June 6, 2023 decision, given that it is a contributing building as part of the heritage conservation district plan. According to the guidelines, Wallace St residences should be guided by the following principle:

*The Street should retain the existing residential character with a single family detached building type and be designed to support a pedestrian streetscape. Where the Official Plan permits, duplexes, triplexes, and quadruplexes may be permitted provided they are carefully designed to appear as single detached dwellings, sensitive to abutting contributing buildings and landscapes, and provided they maintain existing side yard and front yard setbacks, are of a similar building height, and are of a building frontage width which is consistent with adjacent single detached dwellings.*

From the (very limited) photos and renderings provided, the proposed semi-detached

new build does not appear as a single detached dwelling and does not seem to fulfill this requirement. Both the duplex that would replace 56 Wallace and the new proposed build do not have any significant front yard set-backs (as indicated in the guidance), certainly not in line with what currently exists and is in character with the other houses on near it on that part of the block, and most of what is proposed would be front driveways (again, not in keeping with the style that currently characterizes that side of the street). I am worried that approval for demolition would be granted for a contributing building and do not recall any opportunity to provide comment on this June 6, 2023 decision.

Furthermore, that approval was subject to review should the proposal change significantly. From what I can tell, the proposal that was approved contained renovations to 66 Wallace St and *no* additional new property between 56 and 66. This new proposal contains *no* renovations to 66 Wallace St and includes an additional new property, which also does not appear to be designed to accord with the heritage guidelines.

I also believe that the photos of the proposed new building and new duplex (that would replace 56 Wallace) are misleading in terms of their effects on neighbouring property. Currently, the driveway of 56 Wallace separates it from the house next door, but this proposal would eliminate the side driveway (including existing side yard setbacks, another violation of the heritage plan) and put the new house much closer to the existing neighbouring property. The photos do not show the existing property and thus do not accurately present the imposition of this new build on the neighbouring property. To summarize these points: there are *multiple* violations of the stated heritage plan for this street and this area; if we are serious about preserving the heritage of this historical street and district, we must ensure that proposed changes abide by those guidelines.

As a property owner at [REDACTED] Wallace St, the land that abuts the back edge of our property is apparently to be conveyed to the city, yet there is no explanation of what that means in practice. We would like more information regarding what could happen with this area - would it remain wooded area block off sound from the trains and be maintained by the City? Since we have lived here, that area has been by no means "well maintained" but almost a year ago, someone put in a fence at 1 Memorial Hill Drive, fencing off the property's yard from the area that is to be conveyed. We are not certain if this fencing was a way to anticipate city approval of the proposal, or whether it was connected with the construction of a pool on that property (which we assume was approved for construction). Since that time, the area abutting our back yard has become completely overgrown, and contains trash, with apparently no one from that property (including the property owner) taking responsibility for maintaining it. This proposal has *not* yet been

approved, so the responsibility for maintaining this area still lies with the property owner, and there is no evidence that this responsibility is being fulfilled.

As concerned neighbouring homeowners, we expect to know how the city would maintain these lands being conveyed to it: would it be maintained, to ensure that there is no danger of trees falling? Would there be any chance of the city selling it for further development? All of these actions have potential impact on neighbouring properties and families, yet nothing has been explained as to the impacts, responsibilities and future plans.

I would also like to raise concerns with property maintenance for the affected properties. 56 Wallace St has been a rental since our family moved here in February 2021 and up until recently, has been *very* poorly maintained, with no front yard maintenance for months at a time. Similarly, for many months last year, a water leak from 1 Memorial Hill Drive was resulting in a steady stream of water down the hill, pooling where it intersects with Wallace Street, both wasteful and creating a pedestrian hazard. When this was finally reported, maintenance workers reported to neighbourhood residents that the tenants at 1 Memorial Hill Drive had apparently been complaining to the landlord/property owner for a long time to get them to fix this leak, but the owner had refused to do so, until it was reported to the city.

These issues are ultimately the responsibility of the landlord/owner, and I find it hard to see why a property owner would be "rewarded" with the opportunity to build more and make more income, if they have not shown themselves to be responsible caretakers for their existing properties, in ways that negatively affect others in the neighbourhood. This is not a good precedent to set for approving future projects.

Thank you for considering these concerns. I may not be able to attend the meeting on June 4, in person or virtually, so I appreciate these issues being raised on my behalf and answered to our satisfaction and to the satisfaction of other affected neighbourhood residents.

With thanks,  
Matt Walton  
█ Wallace St