

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Francesca Laratta](mailto:Francesca.Laratta)
Subject: FW: [External] Comments on Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.26.007
Date: Monday, March 30, 2026 11:55:12 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Erin Rose [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 11:47 AM
To: Joshua Lacaria <Joshua.Lacaria@vaughan.ca>; DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: Lee Chitiz [REDACTED]
Subject: [External] Comments on Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.26.007

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.

Comments & Requests Regarding Proposed Development

Submitted by Erin Rose and Lee Chitiz on Behalf of Residents of Cedarpoint Court

We respectfully submit the following requests as conditions of approval for the proposed development adjacent to Cedarpoint Court. Our primary concerns relate to water management, given existing flooding issues, as well as built form compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Our basement has had water for the last 12 months, despite numerous attempts by professionals to address the situation. The proposed development is expected to make this worse, unless proper consideration is given.

Water Management Requirements

1. Stormwater Management and Grading

Approval should be conditional upon a finalized and peer-reviewed stormwater management and grading plan demonstrating that there will be no increase in surface or subsurface waterflow to adjacent properties. The developer must ensure that post-development runoff to Cedarpoint Court does not increase in rate or volume compared to pre-development conditions. Specific measures should include rear-yard swales, subsurface drainage systems, and engineered retaining wall drainage to direct runoff away from existing homes. Due to the elevation differences, rear-yard grading must direct all surface runoff away from existing properties, with swales along the rear lot lines and a minimum 2% slope away from the property line.

2. Subsurface Drainage Controls

Given the significant groundwater issues in the area, the developer should be required to install rear-lot catch basins, storm connections, and perimeter drainage systems tied into existing storm infrastructure.

3. Retaining Walls

Any new or modified retaining walls must include proper drainage behind the wall and must receive structural approval and certification from a geotechnical engineer. The developer must be responsible for the long-term maintenance of all retaining walls.

4. Construction-Phase Protections

The developer should be required to complete an approved Erosion and Sediment Control plan, with drainage measures in place during grading and ongoing monitoring throughout construction to ensure runoff is not directed toward existing homes.

5. Post-Construction Monitoring

Given the extensive existing flooding issues on Cedarpoint Court and the elevated risk posed by the higher-grade development lands, the developer should be bound by a minimum two-year post-construction monitoring period, during which time the developer is responsible for remedying any new flooding or drainage impacts to homes on Cedarpoint Court.

Built Form and Landscaping Requirements

6. Landscape Buffer

We request a minimum 3-metre landscape strip along the rear lot line to mitigate privacy, overlook, and visual massing concerns, which are amplified by the 4-5 metre grade difference. Deep-rooted plantings within this strip will also improve infiltration and reduce runoff velocity, serving as a secondary drainage measure. Nursery-grown coniferous trees should be planted at a maximum spacing of 3 metres on centre, at a minimum height of 3 metres, to provide continuous year-round screening. Smaller planting stock would be inadequate given the grade differential. Any dead or failing plantings must be replaced by the developer within one year.

7. Increased Frontage and Rear-Yard Setback

We request a minimum 12-metre frontage and a minimum 9-metre rear-yard setback for all new homes backing onto Cedarpoint Court properties. The current proposal is out of character with the prevailing lot pattern—for example, it would result in five separate lots backing onto a single property. Wider lots also allow more space for swales and infiltration, reducing the concentration of runoff at the rear lot lines.

8. Maximum Two-Storey Height

The proposal for three-storey homes should be refused and a maximum height of two storeys enforced. Even a two-storey home on land 4-5 metres higher than Cedarpoint Court will function visually as a three-storey structure. Three-storey homes would create persistent overlook into rear yards, increase shadowing, and result in loss of sky views. Cedarpoint Court has no three-storey homes, and the new development should respect and reinforce the existing neighbourhood character.

