

C56.

Communication

CW(PM) – June 4, 2025

Item No. 4

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Assunta Ferrante](#)
Subject: FW: [External] OP Amendment File OP.25.003 & Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.25.0004 (Scheduled for Public Hearing on June 4, 2025)
Date: Friday, May 30, 2025 8:34:49 AM

From: Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 6:06 PM
To: Kathryn Simpson [REDACTED]; Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: Marisa D'Ambrosio <Marisa.D'Ambrosio@vaughan.ca>; Marco Ricciuti <Marco.Ricciuti@vaughan.ca>; Nancy Tamburini <Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca>
Subject: RE: [External] OP Amendment File OP.25.003 & Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.25.0004 (Scheduled for Public Hearing on June 4, 2025)

Hi Kathryn,

Thank you for taking the time to share your concerns, I appreciate that. I am hosting a meeting Monday June 2nd at 6:30 at City Hall in the Woodbridge Room (2nd floor). Feel free to join us as we discuss our next steps regarding this development.

Warmest regards,

Rosanna

From: Kathryn Simpson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 3:51 PM
To: Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Linda Jackson <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; Marilyn lafrate <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Mario Ferri <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Gino Rosati <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; mayor@vaughan.ca; Adriano Volpentesta <Adriano.Volpentesta@vaughan.ca>; Gila Martow <Gila.Martow@vaughan.ca>; Chris Ainsworth <Chris.Ainsworth@vaughan.ca>; Racco@vaughan.ca
Subject: RE: [External] OP Amendment File OP.25.003 & Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.25.0004 (Scheduled for Public Hearing on June 4, 2025)

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 Councillor DeFrancesca,

My name is Kathryn Simpson. I am a resident of Ward 3, and live at Pine Valley and Teston Road, in the Pine Valley Estates.

It has come to my attention that the above-noted two (2) applications are being considered by City Council. The applications seek to build two (2) condominium buildings, within a residential subdivision.

I write to you first and foremost, to voice my opposition to these applications. I understand that several neighbors within my community and in nearby effected areas, have done so as well.

I write secondly, to provide some legal context as to why City Council should decline to accept these applications:

- a. The applications require an OP amendment. This should not be taken lightly, considering the City has spent countless hours and millions of dollars creating said OP. While I have not reviewed the current OP, I cannot imagine that same outlines high-density residential condominiums to be built within residential subdivisions, on arterial roads, which have no way of handling the traffic that comes from the increased density;
- b. I have lived in Vaughan for almost my entire life. I cannot think of any areas of the City, where a residential condo has been built within a residential single-family subdivision. Accordingly, allowing this application would set a disastrous precedent for Vaughan in the future;
- c. Traffic is already bad enough as it is on Pine Valley. While the Teston road expansion had eased some of this, the fact remains that hundreds of future houses are planned to be built on Teston, both east and west of Pine Valley. The practical reality is that condominiums would add density to a level whereby the current roadway infrastructure simply will not be able to handle same
- d. The development that had occurred in the area over the last few years (Goldpark; Lindvest; Countrywide; Mosaik), along with future development on Teston (Greenpark) was always advertised to be single-family homes and certain limited townhomes. The developers in the area, specifically Countrywide, have never advertised to consumers their intent to sneak in the back door and build 450+ condominium units. In my opinion, this amounts to false advertising and manipulative business practices, which Council

should consider. Hundreds of citizens purchased homes, in this area, anticipating the area to be filled with single-family homes. If this application proceeds, not only is this promise broken, but undoubtedly other developers will follow suit, and council will not be able to prevent this area from being littered with condominiums;

- e. Practically speaking, a condominium in this area makes no sense. The current OP allows for high density (i.e. Condominiums) to be built near by major intersections, on major roads, and ideally close-by public services (i.e buses; shopping centers; etc). None of those conditions exist in our area.

I ask that you consider all of the above, and decline to pass the above-noted Applications.

Thank You,