

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Committee of Adjustment Mailbox](#); [Christine Vigneault](#); [REDACTED];  
**Subject:** [External] Fw: Variance Application Application A118/24  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 10, 2024 5:56:27 PM

---

**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.

---

**Subject:** Variance Application A118/24

Dear Committee of Adjustment,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding Application A118/24, which seeks a variance to increase the maximum allowable lot coverage from 35% to 46.23% for the property located at 71 Appian Way. Below is a summary of the pertinent history and specific issues related to this application:

**Historical Context:**

In 2017 the properties at 71 and 75 Appian Way were originally a single lot with an approximate frontage of 98 feet. The developer's application to sever the lot into two parcels, each with an approximate frontage of 49 feet, faced significant opposition from local residents. Despite a petition from the majority of Appian Way's residents to maintain the R1 zoning requirement of a minimum 60-foot frontage, the Committee of Adjustment approved a frontage reduction to just under 50 feet. However, they adhered to the staff recommendation to preserve the existing setbacks, lot coverage, and height to avoid negatively impacting the residential streetscape.

**Current Concerns:**

Given the well-documented opposition from Appian Way residents regarding any deviations from R1 requirements dating back to 2007, it is surprising to see this new variance application being considered. The property at 71 Appian Way has already benefited from a significant reduction in lot frontage. It raises concerns about how many variances are deemed acceptable before they constitute an overreach, undermining the intent of the minor variance process. The Greater Woodbridge Rate Payers Association and local residents have previously expressed concerns about potential alterations to

setbacks and lot coverage leading to long, narrow structures. Despite these concerns, they have been largely ignored, forcing us to once again defend our position. It is frustrating that the implications for my family and the community are not being adequately considered, especially since we adhered to the R1 requirements intended to promote conformity and ensure a pleasant residential experience.

#### Impact on My Property:

Allowing an increase in lot coverage to 46.23% on a 49-foot frontage lot will impose undue hardship on my family. It will result in a long corridor from the north entry point to my backyard, extending beyond the midpoint of my rear yard. This configuration would create a confined space akin to a downtown alley, severely limiting natural light to my sunroom and deck, potentially affecting our privacy and overall enjoyment of our home. The emotional and mental impact of this variance, if granted, would be significant and unjust, especially considering that we have adhered to the R1 requirements and our home design was approved by the City of Vaughan.

#### Additional Concerns:

- ☐☐☐ The development agreement mandates the installation of a catch sewer basin along the rear fence line to prevent flooding onto the adjacent property at 67 Appian Way. This installation should be completed before any building permit is issued.
- ☐☐☐ The pressure-treated soundproof fence at 67 Appian Way, a requirement of the City of Vaughan, has been severely disturbed due to ongoing construction activities and requires extensive repair.
- ☐☐☐ The placement of AC units along the same fence corridor will likely result in excessive noise.
- ☐☐☐ The notice for this variance request was insufficiently disseminated; the signage on the property is too small and not all neighbors received the notice.
- ☐☐☐ The developer's commitments to complete landscaping, resurfacing of Appian Way, removal of the hammerhead, and other obligations are overdue. We understand that the City has a letter of credit from the developer to ensure compliance with the City of Vaughan's requirements. Unless the Catch basin is installed and all other requirements are satisfied, no further building permits should be issued.
- ☐☐☐ The development agreement is with the developer rather than the lot owner. Should the variance request not have been brought forward by the developer? who is responsible for fulfilling these agreements.

Kindly review the above-attached photos and ask yourself, how would it feel if someone wanted to limit the enjoyment of your home?

I trust that our concerns will be thoroughly considered as part of the evaluation process for this application and that the conclusion is to reject this application. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards,

Mario DiNardo  
67 Appian Way  
Woodbridge, On L4L 8Y4







