

From: [Hank Liu](#)
To: DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca; [Chris Ainsworth](#); [Cindy Furfaro](#); [Steven Del Duca](#); [Linda Jackson](#); [Mario Ferri](#); [Gino Rosati](#); [Mario G. Racco](#); [Marilyn Iafrate](#); [Adriano Volpentesta](#); [Rosanna DeFrancesca](#); [Gila Martow](#); [Haiging Xu](#); [Preserve Upper Thornhill Estates](#)
Subject: [External] Proposed Development: Z.22.043 Location: Block 279, 65M-4491, 87 Keatley Drive
Date: January-20-25 8:19:15 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.

Dear Vaughan City Council & City Planning Department.

I am writing to formally express my objection to both the original (again) and amended rezoning and development applications for the property located at **87 Keatley Drive**.

Thank you for your dedication to listening to the community and taking steps to address our concerns by preventing the construction of the proposed condominium. Your dedication to support the community reflects your commitment to preserving the character of our neighbourhood and ensuring that local voices are heard. However, we urge you to not overlook the key risks that still exist in this community. Increased traffic congestion and inadequate green spaces remain critical concerns that demand immediate attention. As well, this community NEEDS more commercial spaces. The area is not accessible and frankly, there is no where to work, walk to or enjoy. We need to build robust communities not just homes on top of homes.

While we are grateful for your efforts, we encourage a more comprehensive approach to addressing these underlying challenges for the long-term well-being of Vaughan.

The developer ONLY paid \$4 million dollars for this land. They are purposing 104 stacked townhomes to be sold at \$1 million EACH.

We urge the city to act and negotiate with the developer to move the exit / entrance on to Queen Filomena or Bathurst Street. Please do not take NO for an answer. This is YOUR city to protect. We have been told that the developer cannot afford to make such an amendment.

The developer CAN afford to lose units. The community CANNOT afford to put their safety at risk. Keatley Drive is only 8 meters wide and only has one sidewalk.

We MUST be proactive with safety and traffic. Putting a no parking sign is not an effective solution.

Key Issues with the Proposals

Traffic Congestion

The proposed development (s) will exacerbate existing traffic issues in the area. This community's roadways are already strained during peak hours, the added volume from this project has not been adequately addressed in either the original or revised plans.

Furthermore, the amended proposal still includes an entrance on Keatley Dr., which would significantly worsen traffic flow during peak hours. This entrance would create bottlenecks, increase congestion, and compromise safety for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Parking Needs

The amended proposal continues to fall short in addressing parking requirements. With the projected increase in density, there is a glaring lack of provision for adequate parking spaces for residents, visitors, and service vehicles. This will inevitably lead to overflow parking on nearby streets, further disrupting traffic flow and creating additional challenges for the community.

Impact on Local Schools

The development fails to account for the strain it will place on our local schools. Many schools in the area are already operating at or near capacity, and neither proposal includes a comprehensive plan to address the need for additional school facilities or resources to accommodate the projected population increase.

Negative Environmental Impact

The development raises serious environmental concerns for the community. Increased density, traffic, and construction will contribute to higher levels of air and noise pollution. Additionally, the lack of green space and proper environmental considerations in the plans does not align with Vaughan's sustainability goals. A project of this scale should incorporate strategies to minimize its environmental footprint, such as improved stormwater management, tree preservation, and energy-efficient designs, none of which have been adequately addressed in the current proposals.

Responsible Development Criteria

Both the original and amended applications fall short of meeting the community's standards for responsible and sustainable development. They lack meaningful consideration for the long-term impact on Vaughan's infrastructure, environment, and overall quality of life for current residents. Responsible development should prioritize balanced growth that enhances the community—not strain it further.

Recommendation

IF the City of Vaughan sees a path forward to re-zone 87 Keatley Dr. from the current commercial zoning to a residential zoning, I strongly recommend that the rezoning be limited to **low-density residential zoning** that has been well planned. This approach would be consistent with the current character and fabric of the community while addressing concerns about infrastructure capacity, traffic, parking e. Low-density residential development is far better aligned with the needs of the neighbourhood and ensures that any new development integrates seamlessly into the community.

Request for Action:

I urge the Council and Mayor's office to:

Reevaluate the zoning applications with a stronger focus on addressing traffic congestion, including removing any entrance on Keatley Avenue.

Address parking, school capacity, environmental concerns, and other critical community infrastructure needs.

Require the developers to propose a plan that aligns with Vaughan's vision for responsible and sustainable growth and respects the low-density character of the surrounding area.

Continue to facilitate a transparent dialogue with all parties to ensure that the community's concerns are genuinely considered and addressed as the amended proposal does not offer enough time for thorough input.

When you vote YES on January 21st, please continue to fight for the residents of Vaughan and ask the developer to respect the character of the community and move the entrance.

Our community deserves thoughtful development that prioritizes the well-being of current and future residents. I trust that the Council will take these concerns into account and act in the best interest of OUR community.

Regards,

Hao Liu

■ **Keatley Drive, Maple ON** ■