

**Subject:** Concerns Re: OP.19.003 and Z.19.008 - 4101 Rutherford Road

**From:** Scarpino, Anthony <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 12:16 PM  
**To:** Messere, Clement <Clement.Messere@vaughan.ca>  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Sylvia Cover-Scarpino <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Concerns Re: OP.19.003 and Z.19.008 - 4101 Rutherford Road

c 13  
Communication  
COUNCIL: Oct 2/19  
PH Rpt. No. 26 Item 5

Anthony Scarpino P.Eng, M.A.Sc, PEO, OSPE  
[REDACTED] Pinemeadow Drive  
Woodbridge ON  
[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

I have been a resident of Ward 3 in Vaughan for 19 years, soon to be 20 years. I am a professional engineer with over 25 years in the field. I live within the 650m polling radius of the proposed project at 4101 Rutherford Road.

I oppose the use of the land at 4101 Rutherford Road (Subject Lands) to accommodate at 7-story mixed-use residential apartment building. I also oppose the Official Plan Amendment to File OP.19.003 to amend Vaughan Official Plan (VOP 2010) to increase the maximum permitted height from 4-storeys and 1.5 times the area of the lot TO 7-storeys and 3.15 times the area of the lot respectively.

The basis for my opposition to this use of the Subject Lands and OP Amendment are detailed below:

1. **Historical Basis:** My first challenge of the proposed changes to amend the "VOP 2010" (VOP) plan are based on the intent of the original VOP. There was a distinct and important reason that the VOP specified that the "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" designation of the Subject Lands was restricted to 4-storeys and 1.5 times the area of the lot. Part of this reason is a well-known concept with any urban planner, and that is to keep "like" structures within a specific area. The notion of an "erratic" or outstanding structure within a given area, breaks the visual flow, and generally puts nearby inhabitants at a disadvantage when comparing the market value of their properties. The VOP allows residents that wish to reside within a specific part of the city to envision their home setting & surrounding areas. If they wished to live in an area near high structures, I seriously doubt they would have moved into these subdivisions in the first place. This amendment takes that vision of home setting away from many folks close to the proposed Subject Lands
2. **Privacy Concerns:** One of the key positive elements of a "suburban" home, like those found in the subdivisions around the Subject Lands, is the notion of that backyard environment. For many Ward 3 residents (and I am sure the members of our City Council can relate), it is a small private oasis to sit with your family outdoors, and have a meal, or relax by a pool. Most of us with suburban homes, really enjoy our backyards and enjoy that privacy. This appreciation for that privacy is usually noted by fencing, trees or landscaping. The proposed amendment to the VOP would take that away from a significant number of residents in areas surrounding the proposed 7-story structure. At 7 storeys, it would be trivial to survey nearly backyard within the 650m polling area (and well beyond with magnified optical or photographic equipment). Privacy is a very important concern for residents of any city, and privacy is coming under more legal scrutiny every day. I am deeply concerned about any decision that affects the privacy of so many people within one decision of the City Council.
3. **Density Concerns and Quality of Life:** One has to place themselves in the shoes of the residents immediately across the street from the Subject Lands. Please try to imagine coming out of your front door, and having a 7-storey structure (a minimum of 70ft/21m) only 50 feet away (approximately). What happened to my Western sky? What happened to my sunsets in my front living room? I am not certain about what members of the

Council think about this, but it would certainly be enough for me to move away (and at a potentially considerable financial loss due to loss in value of the home). Would honoured members of the Council seriously considering moving into a home that is now unable to appreciate the sunlight for a significant part of the day?

4. Traffic Concerns: I think it's no secret that traffic within Weston Downs has been an ongoing concern for many years. There is no doubt in my mind that adding 139 residences at 4101 Rutherford Road would make morning and evening commutes worse. If there is any doubt in the mind of the councillors, please note that the very popular "Waze" application for mobile devices (that provides traffic guidance for drivers), now often redirects traffic south on Velmar Drive and through the subdivision in the mornings (often between 8:30 to 9:30 am). Adding 139 residences at Rutherford Road and Velmar Drive will add more chaos to the already known problem, exacerbated by the closure of Pine Valley Road at Rutherford Road. Traffic is funneled East through the Rutherford corridor each morning, on their commute to the 400 highway.

I believe that our council has an obligation to do what is "best" for the city AND it's residents. As a resident of Ward 3, I do not see a benefit with the proposed condominium NOR the proposed changes to the Vaughan Official Plan of 2010. I strongly oppose applications under file OP.19.003 and Z.19.008 due to the impacts I have stated above.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Scarpino