

**VAUGHANWOOD RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION INC.**

**FOREST CIRCLE COURT  
WOODBIDGE, ONTARIO**

**C2**

**Communication**

**CW(1) – September 10, 2024**

**Item No. 4**

**September 10, 2024**

**City of Vaughan  
Office of the City Clerk and Members of Council  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1**

**WE REQUEST THAT THIS WRITTEN LETTER BE A PART OF THE PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**RE: FILE OP.22.016 & Z.22.036**

**Wigwoss Investments Inc. & 2561658 Ontario Inc.  
10, 20, 24 Wigwoss Drive**

The Vaughanwood Ratepayers agrees with the Staff recommendation for the refusal for the above site. The application does not satisfy the VROP2022 or conforms to or meet the general intend of the VOP2010. The development is not compatible with the existing and planned surrounding land uses.

As stated in the recommendation, the Development Planning Department is not satisfied that the Development provides for an appropriate mix of uses as directed by the YROP 2022 to these areas (Policy 2.3) and does not provide for an appropriate transition of built form to adjacent areas (Policy 2.3.11) in a manner that complements the existing community, as envisioned by VOP 2010. On this basis, the Development does not conform to the YROP 2022.

I have attached the issues that were raised on February 6<sup>th</sup> public hearing therefore they do not need to be repeated in my deputation on behalf of the Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association Inc.

However, the issues raised were never brought forward by the applicant and are still outstanding issues:

- Transportation Impact Study update to reflect 2024 traffic and satisfaction with access design
- 45 degree angular plane not provided
- TRCA has outstanding comments which have not been addressed
- 1000m for archaeological assessment prior to the submission of the application
- No community meeting

Please note that the minutes of Council of June 26, 2012 indicates to cap the maximum height of this site to 6 stories. This area has been reviewed several times not to exceed 6 stories.

Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association Inc. is seeking direction from Council to ensure legal representation from the City of Vaughan will be present in representing the matter for the City at the OLT hearing on May 26<sup>th</sup> to June 6, 2025. The residents at the time of the case management hearing had to incur expenses of hiring their own solicitor on the matter as the residents were not aware of where the City stood on this matter. This is a matter where the City needs to take ownership on the issue not the residents.

Mary Mauti  
President of the Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association Inc.

**VAUGHANWOOD RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION INC.**

**FOREST CIRCLE COURT  
WOODBIDGE, ONTARIO**

**February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**City of Vaughan  
Office of the City Clerk and Members of Council  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1**

**WE REQUEST THAT THIS WRITTEN LETTER BE A PART OF THE PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**RE: FILE OP.22.016 & Z.22.036  
Wigwoss Investments Inc. & 2561658 Ontario Inc.  
10, 20, 24 Wigwoss Drive**

We, Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association oppose the application. The applicant is seeking approval for 12 storey FSI of 4.3 while the current designation is 6 storey FSI of 2.5 as per VOP 2010 The Schedule 13 indicates this area shall not exceed the height of 6 storey FSI of 2.5. This matter should also refer to the June 26, 2012, Council meeting minutes where the Commissioner of Planning recommended to cap the maximum height and density to 6 storey FSI of 2.5 for this area. It was also recommended to establish a step-down zone to ensure a transition in building heights to the sensitivity to the low rise residential to the north. This area has been reviewed several times not to exceed the 6-storey height. The proposed 12 storey building form does not provide the appropriate height or transition to the stable residential area to the north. As per VOP 2010 policy 9.2.3.5 permits mid-rise however it's regulated with the policy VOP 2010 9.2.14 Schedule 13 maximum of 6 storey density of FSI 2.5 in this area.

We recognize that growth and intensification is in the forefront of both Provincial and Regional agendas, however at this location, the current infrastructure does not support urban growth. There is a bottle neck of traffic due to the slope of Highway 7, CN Railway Bridge. Until this is addressed this area does not merit more intensification. **The Province and York Region Plans are doing everything in respect to intensification and building more affordable homes for people. It does not, however support intensification if it causes detriment to the existing surrounding homes or where amenities and infrastructure are lacking to justify intensification.** This application would negatively affect the standard of living for the people residing in this predominantly low-rise neighbourhood and only add to the issues the other neighbouring condos have created around the area. When intensifying you must take into consideration how any new proposed developments will affect the architecture and landscape of the existing neighborhood. Existing residents, specifically the adjoining properties should not be subjected to change that will negatively affect their existing use. Intensification should not be filtering onto other existing mature settled residential areas. Vehicular access should be contained on highway 7 not impeding local street traffic in the existing mature settled community.

**The Provincial Policy and Framework Including York Region is a general policy, and Local Official Plans are meant to provide details. For this site as noted in the beginning of my submission, Council decided to limit the height and density in 2012 after consideration and public input. This area from Wigwoss Drive to Islington Avenue should be considered an exception due to the sensitivity of many factors in the area. Stop adding more density than permitted to infill sites in place of urban sprawl!** Silo applications should not be accepted until a secondary plan, or a control bylaw should be placed in the area to determine good planning, infrastructure, and transit can be built with the appropriate land and flow of traffic. The proposal for intensification before us, has a building orientation and access on low-rise local residential street, and not off the Regional Corridor.

The existing building to the west (4800 Highway 7) of the proposed site was approved in 2013 at the OMB. At the time the designation of OP 661 supported a maximum of 10 storey FSI of 3.0 on that site. The City had a new Official Plan which was adopted in 2010 however was appealed to the Board but not yet in force. VOP 2010 changed to 6 storeys FSI of 2.5, therefore the building was approved/settled at the OMB between the changes of the OP. No other building in this area obtained this height. Therefore, this application does not blend in with the existing community as stated by the applicant.

According to PAC it encourages the applicant to pre consultant with the ratepayers in the area prior to the submission which this was not done. This also was ignored for the residents of the area.

The site is 600m of the 1000 meter buffer for archaeological assessment as identified by the York Region archaeological mapping for potential ossuaries which should be completed according to the Mackenzie Woodland Village report and ROPA 6. To date an archaeological assessment has not been completed. According to VOP 2010 Policy section 10.2.2.2 which defines "Archaeological Potential" are determined using Provincial screening or criteria developed based on the know archeological record with the City and developed by a licensed archaeologist. Is this process in place in order to ignore 1000m buffer to determine the archaeological assessment prior to pre consultation? This area is the only area in Vaughan that has an indigenous burial site. Bodies have been removed from Almont Park in 1980 which is 600m from the site. As per part of the truth and reconciliation Act the City has an obligation and a duty to consult with the indigenous community! So much confusion with the 3 different levels of government on the mapping of archaeological and ossuary layers.

A noise report does not measure the consistent opening and closing of the garage doors. This will be an issue for the existing residents that are abutting the ramp to underground garage. The ramp to the underground garage should be facing highway 7 to avoid this issue. No reports have been provided to measure this noise level which will impact the existing residents.

A review of the proposed development infringes on the required lack of privacy due to the balconies, common roof terrace facing the resident to the north vs highway 7, shadowing on the neighbours, noise of garage doors, traffic, density, overflow parking on Wigwoss Drive. A chunk of the building is not within the 45-degree angular plane and towers over the low-rise neighbourhood to the north. **Its irregular degree and misleading!** It does not comply as per your VOP 2010 policy 9.2.3.5 c. The application is too large for the small property in which they want to build. Minimal setbacks, for example a .3m (1 foot) setback from garage structure to neighbouring properties limits space to install shoring and tiebacks for the garage structure. They will encroach on neighbouring properties. Crane swing over the properties, 4 years of construction in a settled existing area. A construction management plan will never support the undue impacts to the existing neighbourhood. The application is within 300 meters of highly vulnerable aquifers. Is this safe development?

Our Association has gone on **records prior to intensification** this area cannot permit additional density. Please consider all the facts stated this evening in determining your consideration for the area in respect **to good planning** for the existing residents for an infill site. The application does not comply with the City OP and Policy. Council and Staff in 2012 confirmed specifically to have restrictive height for this area.

**STAFF AND COUNCIL ON THE FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING SHOULD RECOMMEND REFUSAL.**

Mary Mauti  
President  
Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association