

From: [Eduardo Nunez](mailto:Eduardo.Nunez@vaughan.ca)
To: DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca; [Chris Ainsworth](mailto:Chris.Ainsworth@vaughan.ca); [Cindy Furfaro](mailto:Cindy.Furfaro@vaughan.ca); [Steven Del Duca](mailto:Steven.DelDuca@vaughan.ca); [Linda Jackson](mailto:Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca); [Mario Ferri](mailto:Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca); [Gino Rosati](mailto:Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca); [Mario G. Racco](mailto:Mario.G.Racco@vaughan.ca); [Marilyn Iafrate](mailto:Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca); [Adriano Volpentesta](mailto:Adriano.Volpentesta@vaughan.ca); [Rosanna DeFrancesca](mailto:Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca); [Gila Martow](mailto:Gila.Martow@vaughan.ca); [Haiping Xu](mailto:Haiping.Xu@vaughan.ca); preserve.ute@gmail.com
Subject: [External] Proposed Development: Z.22.043 Location: Block 279, 65M-4491, 87 Keatley Drive
Date: January-20-25 10:04:32 PM
Importance: High

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 want to thank you for continuously demonstrating your deep interest in what is best for our community and actively listening to our concerns. As you know, we as a community object to both, the original and amended re-zoning and development applications for the property located on **87 Keatley Drive**.

We urge you to not overlook the key risks that remain with the amended plan, including but not limited to increased traffic congestion, safety concerns, as well as inadequate green spaces for the area. In addition, the original plan included accessible commercial spaces which is what this community really needs, as current ones are not accessible unless we drive to them.

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.

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 advised that developer's position, is that by doing so, this project would not be profitable enough, which we find hard to believe given that they ONLY paid \$4 million dollars for this land. Losing a few units out of the 104 stacked townhomes which they plan to sell at \$1 million EACH should not impact too much the return of their investment. In fact, having the entrance on such a narrow street as it is Keatly, may discourage potential buyers and may be commercially wiser to have the entrance on a wider street.

We strongly believe that the developer CAN afford to lose units, but the community CANNOT afford to put the safety of their family members at risk. Keatley Drive is only 8 meters wide and only has one sidewalk; it is already congested enough and increasing traffic could mean First responders not being able to get through on emergency situations. We MUST be proactive with safety and traffic. Putting a no parking sign is not an effective solution.

Key Issues with the Proposals

1. Traffic Congestion

The proposed development (s) will exacerbate existing traffic issues in the area. The 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.

2. **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.

3. **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.

4. **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.

5. **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.
- Even if you vote YES to the developer's amended proposal 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,

Eduardo Nunez

■ Keatley Drive

Maple ON ■