


**From:** Olton Hysenbegas <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 23, 2020 2:01 PM  
**To:** Britto, John <[John.Britto@vaughan.ca](mailto:John.Britto@vaughan.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Deputation on a matter that is not on an Agenda



Thank you Mr. Britto.

I will try to summarize in a one pager the deputation however as reference please ensure that the feedback and minutes from the CofA (email just sent) and the attached petition is printed for all members of the council.

I will be reaching out later next week with the video to be shared before the deputation.

Thank you so much for all your help and support.

Best regards, Olton

## Request/Petition

**To:** The City of Vaughan regarding: application A116/19

Vaughan Committee of Adjustment, Chair and Committee Members

Mr. Alan Shefman Ward 5 councillor [alan.shefman@vaughan.ca](mailto:alan.shefman@vaughan.ca)

Mr. Mario Ferri Deputy Major [mario.ferri@vaughan.ca](mailto:mario.ferri@vaughan.ca)

Mr. Gino Rosati, Local and Regional Councillor [gino.rosati@vaughan.ca](mailto:gino.rosati@vaughan.ca)

Mrs. Linda Jackson, Local and Regional Councillor [linda.jackson@vaughan.ca](mailto:linda.jackson@vaughan.ca)

Awareness: Ward 1 Councillor, Marilyn Iafrate [marilyn.iafrate@vaughan.ca](mailto:marilyn.iafrate@vaughan.ca)

Ward 2 Councillor, Tony Carella [tony.carella@vaughan.ca](mailto:tony.carella@vaughan.ca)

Ward 3 Councillor, Rosanna Defrancesca [rosanna.defrancesca@vaughan.ca](mailto:rosanna.defrancesca@vaughan.ca)

Ward 4 Councillor, Sandra Racco [sandra.racco@vaughan.ca](mailto:sandra.racco@vaughan.ca)

**Date:** Feb.5, 2020

**From:** Residents of Thornhill, neighborhood - Concord Rd, Forest Lane, Bev. Glenn, signatures page 9

██████████ concord Rd, ██████████ concord Rd, ██████████ Vaughan Blvd., ██████████ forest lane drive, ██████████ Bev. Glenn Blvd., ██████████ Loudon crescent).

**Subject:** Concerns on multiple by law changes which result in safety and security issues & risks  
Bylaws noncompliance, adjustments requested are major in nature and are setting precedent for  
Thornhill in particular & proposal from community to city

As mentioned in previous correspondence (contained within), we support all projects that beautify the area/neighborhood. As a community we have had multiple discussions on the many exemptions requested for this application and while some of us were engaged in this process late in Nov.2019 & Dec. 2019 when first hearing happened, some others were able to get information and share concerns in Jan. 2020 (after holiday season), and what has been concerning is we have to pay for specialist/professional advice to protect our rights, study all by laws by ourselves. We all pay taxes and we expect the city to treat us in a fair, just manner and standards and by laws to be applied to all citizens consistently. The role of the city and its departments is to be the regulator and ensure its bylaws protect its citizens.

Page 1-2 concerns from the community directed to all officials and committees copied to this petition

Page 3-4 concerns with the staff report, on technical requirements assessment and conclusions

Page 5-6 list of other by laws impacted & safety and security concerns not addressed

Page 7-9 recommendation from community & signatures from the community

We are faced with 6 and more exceptions listed in this application and even though it is been hearings and we have expressed concerns during public hearings, it appears the city departments who should keep in mind the public/community interests, appear to allow for modifications of many city by laws, unclear what is the city benefiting by allowing so many exceptions? Why the standards and by laws do not apply the same, to all citizens?!

A shed located on the back of one of us, which was less than 2 feet set back from the fence was requested by city bylaw to be removed and relocated even though there were no concerns raised from any resident in the area; the resident moved the shed, because we respect bylaws. However in this application it appears to be the opposite situation, where for one resident it is OK to have the city making adjustments/changes to many of its bylaws and not considering the issues, risks and concerns of the community at large, even though that a public hearings are requested, because the applicant is not entitled to the requested changes, unless these significant variances are approved. This can easily become precedent for not only Thornhill, and other areas in Vaughan.

**If this is the case that all bylaws can be adjusted and changed to fit needs of the agent, or anyone as long as they pay, and not consider the community & impacted residents in the neighborhood, then why we have by laws or request public hearings?!**

To address the 23 concerns raised in the letter / petition sent via email (dated: Jan. 16,2020), addressed to Committee of Adjustment and all City of Vaughan departments impacted by this application, we received the response from applicant agent on Jan. 22. The agent is right as per his response of Jan.22, 2020. The onus is on the city to apply bylaws. Because the city is allowing these adjustments to by laws then the city owns the risks, the issues, concerns and third-party litigation risk; applicant agent has made it clear in their response dated Jan. 22,2020.

1. It feels, the city is putting residents at risk? Why the city is putting residents in a position to discuss with the pool company (applicant agent)? Why the city is putting itself at risk?
2. Why the city is not playing the role as the independent body / regulator facilitating win win solution that will address the needs of the community? This area is a school zone (schedule provided as attachment) and because of that safety and security of our kids going to school is paramount.
3. It feels that the city is putting residents against each other?

We have contacted the councilor for the Ward and made him aware of the concerns raised (December 2019) & again on Jan. 17, 2020. Debbie, his secretary was asked to print and to share with Mr.Shefman.

We are advised by CofA representative that the committee looks at the requested adjustments by the applicant (6 adjustments). The fencing, other bylaws other than zoning concerns etc. are not jurisdiction of the committee of adjustment, but city council, hence inclusion to this request/petition. Application cannot be looked in isolation.

The existing zoning & planning for the area does keep an open and "residential estate" look and feel of the area & this is how it is been for the past 30 years. The fencing by law #: sections 3.3, item c as amended and appendix/schedule a does not allow for a fence to be erected in front yard of ■■■ concord rd. Because fence is not allowed beyond the corner of the front wall of ■■■ concord then how can a pool be built on the side of ■■■ forest lane drive, facing front yard of ■■■ concord?? The bylaws regarding pool, includes setbacks, safety requirements and fence for privacy, safety and health reasons.

By Law: 80-90 (by law applicable selected and highlighted and pictures outlined in attachment)	Section 3.3 Attached for ease of convenience the relevant By-law amendment and the Original By law with the Schedule "A" on page 7 of by law 80-90, illustration, for section 3.3 c.
Amendment: 162-2004 (by law selected and highlighted), page 1, item 1, adding paragraph c) to section 3.3 as follows:	<u>"No fence exceeding 1.2 meters (4 feet) in height, whether erected on or inside the property line, shall be erected closer to the front lot line than a point opposite the corner of the front wall containing the front door of any adjacent dwelling".</u>

By law requirement	Proposed adjustment A116/19	Noncompliance with respective by laws
Item 2: the accessory building shall be located in the rear yard only.	To permit shed not to be located in the rear yard only.	As per zoning by law 1-88 this accessory building will be built completely on the side yard. <u>This constitutes a major adjustment because it fails conformity test.</u>
Item 3: Min. exterior side yard setback of 4.5 m.	To permit exterior side yard setback of 1.63 m.	<u>Major deviation from the by law set back requirements. By law: 1-88.</u>
Item 4: A private pool shall be located in rear yard	To permit a pool not to be located entirely in rear yard.	As per zoning by law, 1-88 the swimming pool is to be located <u>Only in rear yard</u> , page 44, section i) "a private swimming pool shall be constructed <u>ONLY</u> in the rear yard and not near any rear or interior side lot line then 1.5 m or to any exterior lot line than the required set back of the main dwelling unit on the lot..." <u>Because 2 forest lane is a corner lot the pool will be located almost all on the side exterior yard as per definitions on the by zoning by law page 16, section 2 definitions. The pool will be facing the front yard of 141 concord rd. This is a not a minor adjustment. Fails the conformity test.</u>
Items 5, 6 Set backs for the pool 1.5 m from rear yard Set back from the exterior side yard 4.5 m	To permit minimum rear yard set back of 1.22 m to pool To permit a minimum exterior yard set back of 3.09m	<u>Modifications / Adjustments look small from a qualitative perspective however set backs for pool are set for safety, health and security and apply to rear yard.</u> The application of setbacks should be more conservative when applied on side/exterior yards respectively. As per community request/petition sent on Dec. 12, 2019 and again on Jan. 16, 2020 impacts to the community are significant.
Concerns on issues raised with city on request dated Jan. 16, 2020 ahead of Feb. 6, 2020 committee of adjustment and city of Vaughan. Request sent by community and responses from applicant agent attached.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information on page 3 of the application is incorrect. Dwelling of 2 forest lane was built in 1997. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. And the shed is not an existing structure.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Application also calls for a cabana. There is none in the drawings/sketch, so it is assumed will be built in the future? Where will be located &amp; how will it impact line of sight triangle?</li> <li>3. Few city dept have no comment or have not seen application? Why?</li> <li>4. Clarifications about the shed, height, cabana height, grading, elevation, drainage, location of new 8 or so trees included in the request of Jan. 16, 2020 were requested to better understand implications for clear line of sight, sight triangle for both forest lane drive/concord and 2 forest lane exterior and 141,145,149 concord (school zone area) and impacts to drainage/grading.</li> <li>5. The proposed shed of 2.5 m tall and fence impact sight triangle forest lane/concord if so, are the sight triangle setbacks considered? As per engineering standard attached, sight triangle required however because of curve on concord 8 x 12 m required (8m x 16m preferred).</li> <li>6. Advised the city that the design for the fence provided by agent was misleading. Information shared with CofA via email.</li> <li>7. Refer to the Transportation Agency of Canada definitions on sight triangle (page #: 13, appendix A).</li> </ol>	

**As per staffing report prepared and circulated for Jan. 16, 2020 & Jan. 30, 2020:**

Committee of Adjustment comment; it is unclear why it is marked as approved? The rest of the areas have expressed no comments or concerns or no objection ... N/A appropriate

**Page 3 of Vaughan staff report – Jan. 16, 2020 & Jan. 30, 2020:**

1. comment from building standards: "the applicant shall be advised that additional variances may be required upon review of detailed drawings for building permit / site approval". – **Why the detailed drawing is not provided and what additional variances may be required?**
2. Development planning on the front yard landscaping of 45.79% (variance 1). "The proposed variance is existing condition and considered minor in nature". **If existing condition then why an exception is required?**
  - Development planning, comment page 3: "owner is requesting construction of a swimming pool and shed in the side yard in the subject lands which is a corner lot of abutting forest lane drive and concord rd. " **This is exactly what we have pointed out that the request is to build the pool and shed in the side yard not partially in the rear and side yard as pointed above on items or variances 2 and 4. Also development planning is considering adjustments minor because there is enough land in the exterior yard?? One of criteria for planning is to do the conformity test. Issues raised by community about impacts to property and also in the area there is no home that has a pool, shed, cabana all on the side yard facing adjacent dwelling front yard/drive way. This application does not pass the conformity test. How come is a minor adjustment?**
  - Development planning comments are unclear in terms of messaging on page 3. As per bullet point c) above the shed and pool will be built on the side/exterior yard, however the paragraphs right below, it states the variances are in the rear and side yards?! Which one is correct? How does the building of a pool, patio, cabana, shed replacing the green and open executive residential area maintain the same intent and purpose of the official plan and zoning by law? The conformity test does not appear to be a pass for this application.
3. **What is the arborist report and how many trees will be replaced and where? Will it impact any of the sight triangles mentioned above?**
4. Development engineering section on page 3: Lot grading, and servicing plan. Because of elevation and existing grading why the final lot grading and servicing plan is not provided for review and approval? **Will this trigger other exceptions?**

Comments from development engineering on Jan. 16, 2020: Given that there is no policy, by law or standard to calculate the setbacks for sight triangle as per development engineering how is it acceptable and adequate what is proposed by agent (pool company), reflected in revised design of Dec. 16 or identical design of Jan. 23 (different date)?
5. In the revised city report of Jan. 30, development engineering response, the example of 4 Fairfax is comparing apples to oranges.
  - the fence is built when home built, applies to both ■ and ■ Fairfax
  - it is ■ Fairfax home backyards, so owner blocking their view; not the same scenario rear and exterior yard facing front yard/drive yard and the road is not curved, in addition city has not provided any adjustment for that that is on file
  - The sight triangle as a definition was introduced in 1999 with by law amendment 240-99 (Jul. 12, 1999) after the original fence was built.

- The property owner of [REDACTED] Bev. Glenn, advised his view is significantly obstructed. He advised that has had a few almost accidents on cars & folks on sidewalk (concurrence added).
- The properties in the Fairfax and area surrounding have a different evaluation and different market value. Properties on Concord, Laurie, King High, Forest lane drive have different market value which is a multiple compared to the properties in Fairfax area.
- As provided in the letter of Jan.16, 2020 [REDACTED] Coldwater/[REDACTED] Beverly Glenn Blvd. shows the exact scenario of [REDACTED] forest lane and [REDACTED] concord and no fence is erected beyond the corner front of [REDACTED] Beverly Glenn property. Picture #: 2, page 7 of letter from community of Jan. 16.
- Owner of [REDACTED] Beverly Glenn Blvd concurrence added. Concerned their view will be obstructed if their [REDACTED] cold water neighbor follows suit similar to this application (because same positioning in terms of back yard/external yard and driveway/front yard). If this application is approved as is it will become a precedent that will impact safety and security for the whole neighborhood.

**Page 4 of Vaughan staff report – Jan. 16, 2020 & Jan. 30, 2020:**

6. Why by-law dept has no response? Many by law variances? What is by law department opinion on non-compliance?
7. As per note on page 4 of staff report above the conditions it outlines other exceptions may be required. What are those?

**other variances on by laws:**

a) By law: 152-2002 (amend the General Provisions of the City of Vaughan Zoning By-law 1-88)

b) section i) "the garden or storage shed shall be located in the rear yard;"

c) section ii) erected in the rear yard only; and, iii) used only as a garden or storage shed.

*Variance 1: => "The Shed must be located in the rear yard and not on the front/exterior yard"*

*Variance 2: => "Purpose for using the Shed as per agent response is to be used to place all the machinery for the swimming pool". As per by law shed is for storage not for machinery/ devices.*

***b.) By law 80-90: "fence erected up to a point opposite to the front corner of the builder nearer the road". Will this require an exemption because as per design fence will be erected beyond that corner of 141 concord rd.? Will this require an exemption?***

**for fence height:**

fence in the rear yard (elevation where the upper patio will be built is 1 meter + 1.5 – 1.8 m fence so the fence will be tall between 2.5 and 2.8 meters from 141 concord rd. grading?? Is this right?

Pool will have a 0.51 m elevation as per sketch, from 141 grading so the fence on top will be between 1.5 – 1.8 as per agent so the fence will be 2 m – 2.3 m (in height) ...Is this right? ***What exemptions will be requested?***

***c.) By law: 203-2006 requests that for the pool to provide complete details for pool enclosure. Views have been requested and 3-dimensional rendering to understand obstruction of view. What was provided was misleading. As per google view of where property line is etc...all that is correct however the view has to include all what is proposed to be built from top, sides, front to have a good understanding of sight triangle, drainage/grading perspective.***

***d.) Will an exemption be requested for a cabana because it is not in the sketch/design but listed in the application? Set backs for cabana are 4.5 m (side) and 7.5m (rear). Where will it be located and will impact sight triangle?***

**e.) TRCA requirements applicable to this application?**

By laws are to protect citizens. The adjustments, variations may look small from a numbers perspective alone and that perhaps considered minor adjustment if looked as a technicality, however the **impacts to the neighborhood are significant**. Looking at just numbers doesn't give the full picture; looking at the qualitative items will allow for the right decision that is win-win for all to be made. We understand our right as per the property standards by law 231, that because changes are asked, if it is not in our community interest, we may not permit. In addition, as per planning act one of the criteria is that the requested variances are acceptable for the appropriate development of subject lands (community concerns and issues raised re: proposed adjustments and safety issues are not addressed).

Our concern is safety for pedestrians, children, dogs and cars walking on the sidewalk and cars driving on concord rd./forest lane dr. Third Party Liability litigation/risk: high risk of endangering children's, pedestrians, dogs, cars. With the original design for this application and modified design/sketches there are serious concerns from a safety standpoint because of obstructed line of sight which will not allow children/pedestrians & cars / traffic to see cars backing out and cars backing out to allow sufficient time to see children, pedestrians and traffic.

- a. Our kids will not enjoy the front yards as they do today when they play in the front yard with their friends' basketball or soccer etc.
- b. Already there has been accidents on concord recorded in the past to present (as shared with committee of adjustment on Dec.12).

The revised design of Dec. 16, 2019 & Jan. 23, 2020 (same different date), shows agent proposed small sight triangle that does not address the safety concern raised by community and as outlined in appendix A, page 13, Transportation Agency of Canada manual. As per discussion with engineering team on Jan. 14, 2020 there is no by law, policy or standard for calculations for this scenario and calculation was done based on people walking on the side walk (method of calculation and criteria does not exist we were told and was not shared). The scenario described for the proposed irregular sight triangle does not consider kids using the bike and biking on the side walk, residents jogging or kids running, dogs unleashed, also based on the speed limit on concord rd. and distance from concord to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] concord rd. properties the time a car can reach them is between 1-3 seconds. In addition, if it is a larger car like a pickup truck (page 10 picture 2), attached will require a deeper and wider set back criterion for safety and security triangle which is not considered. Without proper and clear sight triangle the community does not feel safe.

ii). At the absence of a standard for the scenario known scenarios and engineering standard to be applied. The clear triangle is to be set back in at least, 8 meters in the driveway of [REDACTED] concord rd. and at least 12 meters (preferred 16 m), set back on the exterior yard of [REDACTED] forest lane

iii). The sight triangle to be city owned, so that no changes to the triangle will not be allowed to be made by any of the owners in the future. Nothing is to be planted or built in the safety sight triangle (no shrubs, trees, just to be left with grass and to the grade). City to consider and provide relief to [REDACTED] forest lane property owner. This request is also in alignment with the Transportation Agency of Canada – Appendix A, page 13.

As per discussion with Vaughan planning specialist Jan. 14, 2020, the lot for 2 forest lane, should have been designed differently where the triangle from the intersection of concord and forest lane to [REDACTED] concord driveway should have been owned by city (what we as community requested as unobstructed view in Dec. 11, 2019 (sketch revised Oct. 30, 2019), submitted as attachment to the written submission from community.

Concord rd. has only side walk on located on the front of [REDACTED] concord rd. and exterior yard of [REDACTED] forest lane etc. Residents of both sides of concord rd. use the sidewalk, same applies for forest lane drive road. The many exception to allow this application to proceed will not allow us to enjoy our properties because we will no longer will feel safe in our properties.

<p>In spirit of collaboration and constructive support between us as neighbors, we proposed as per our letter of Jan. 16, 2020 that: the sight triangle to be set up at least 8 meters x at least 12 meters (preferred 16 m), instead of 3.574m x 6.328m, applying the standards set in the engineering dept. and ensuring the area is to be left open, as is same grading, elevation and with grass only... to allow for the clear line of sight triangle now and for future. (refer to table below paragraph for by laws, standards).</p> <p>Clarification on clear line of sight triangle calculation &amp; engineering standards provided attached to this artifact. As per Committee of Adjustment motion of Dec. 12, 2019 following the concerns from the community to add the clear line of sight, engineering added the clear line of sight condition to the application.</p>	<p><u>We were advised by the city engineers that there is no standard for the scenario exterior yard vs front yard intersection, so the proposal was to give a sight triangle of 3.5m to 6.5 m. When requested where this is based, we were told that there is no by law for the calculation of this scenario and no policy or standard.</u></p> <p>We residents of Thornhill, challenged the above and made our proposal below based on traffic by law "284-94", by law 240-99 on "clear sight triangle". Something is not right if we as residents to protect our rights have to pay fees to protect our rights.</p> <p>When we know that there are issues with accidents today in the area; any obstruction of view will make things worse, and is a set up for more accidents to happen. Cannot tell a community that is safe because pool company offered something and they feel still unsafe. <u>This is an irregular sight triangle.</u></p> <p>By laws as it looks are written and give enough room to be interpreted one way and the other to allow for resilience and flexibility. This should allow for the community concerns to be addressed within the parameters of the bylaws.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As per traffic by law 284-94, section (i) on page 1, the driveway because of the traffic on Concord (minor collector) to Bev. Glenn Blvd. (minor collector), driveways are to be considered as intersection to these collectors, due to traffic of pedestrians (both sides of concord use sidewalk), heavy traffic, on page 15 same by law and schedule B, part 2, page 34 same bylaw.</li> </ol> <p>Many cars use [redacted] and [redacted] concord to make turns, to either go back to Beverly Glenn Blvd. or Concord rd. south or north, which raises traffic and the probability of accidents if view is further obstructed as proposed in this application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. As per bylaw 240-99 "sight triangle" means the area of land abutting the corner of a lot of enclosed by the projection of each lot line".</li> <li>3. As per city of Vaughan engineering dept, D-1, confirmed on Jan. 15, 2020 as the most current standard, <u>the 8m x 12m setback to be applied for the sight triangle (preferred 8 x 16 m)</u></li> <li>4. As per bylaw 029-2014 "fence and height exemption are granted only for health and safety of the public" as per section 3.5, bullet point e).</li> <li>5. As per bylaw 029-2014, item f) any comments received from land owners to whom notice has been provided, any impact to sight lines are key criteria as per section f when director of by law and compliance looks for fence exemptions.</li> </ol>
---	---	--

1. No fence for the 2 forest lane drive rear/side/external yard should be allowed to be erected up beyond the point opposite to the front corner of the [redacted] concord rd. (the building nearer the road)" as per by law 162-2004.
2. Sight triangle to be set up 8m x 16 m. as per engineering standard (standard attached) and transportation of Canada (details on page 13). This hearing and this discussion with extensive input from the community, could be looked, considered as an opportunity also for the city to standardize the sight triangle for this scenario and include in a policy or by law as appropriate.
3. We also proposed that the city provide relief to [redacted] forest lane drive given that the clear sight triangle portion of their lot will not be utilized by them, as per by law, and be noted as such on property, so no current or future owners will be allowed to obstruct view. No shrubs, trees etc. are allowed to plant.



When we met at the city with officials from different areas, we were told that there is not enough land to build what is being requested and when speaking to a zoning specialist at the city of Vaughan, we were told that the clear triangle needs to be wider, to be made deeper on both sides to avoid accidents otherwise it is set for accidents to happen. We also were told to ensure to have the condition added that nothing can be planted in that triangle because that will obstruct view in the future. We were shown pictures when trees or shrubs grew over time in those triangles and blocked/obstructed view. As these adjustments for this application are to be presented on Feb. 6, 2020 we expect the city departments to make the appropriate updates as noted in this petition addressing concerns the community is raising to the city of Vaughan and all officials copied and to whom this petition is communicated to and decision to reflect compliance to the by law and community concerns, issues and proposal.

Regards,

**Attachments provided in addition to this petition:**

1. *Engineering Standard for sight triangle confirmed with city as most current on Jan. 14, 2020 (attached as a file)*
2. *By laws 80-90, and all amendments and outlined in attached submission (attached as a file)*
3. *Outlined issues with staff report on page 3 and 4 of the city staff report (in this document)*
4. *School zone area defined where [REDACTED] concord rd. homes and other homes on forest lane, Vaughan and Coldwater etc. are defined to be part of the school zone (schedule e-705; section 9/630) (attached as a file)*
5. *Video showing traffic on concord rd. (to be sent via a file sharing tool or play using own phone)*

**Note:** *this petition will be used in case of appeal to the local planning appeal tribunal in case of unfavorable decision from committee of adjustment. In case of LPAT hearing more residents have expressed support and will be added to this petition.*

List of owners that provided electronic concurrence for this request/petition (owners email addresses added to the submission).

1. Arion Hysenbegas - [REDACTED] concord rd.

2. Vjollca Hysenbegas - [REDACTED] concord rd.

3. Selda Hysenbegas - [REDACTED] concord rd.

4. Olton Hysenbegas - [REDACTED] concord rd.

5. Ted Szilagy - [REDACTED] concord rd.

6. Robyn Szilagy - [REDACTED] concord rd.

7. Anna Brandes - [REDACTED] concord rd.

8. Dov Brandes - [REDACTED] concord rd.

9. Joel Majer - [REDACTED] Vaughan Blvd.

10. Tuula Katz - [REDACTED] Forest Lane Drive

11. David Katz - [REDACTED] Forest Lane Drive

12. Vladimir Mikovov


[REDACTED] Beverley Glen Blvd

13. Christina Chen [REDACTED] Beverley Glen

14. GREG NYDELMAN, [REDACTED] Loudon Crescent

Electronic Concurrence  
via e-mail, Feb. 4, 2029  
AT 11:16 AM

Picture 1&2: ( [REDACTED] forest lane/ [REDACTED] concord rd.). Sedan parked and pickup truck parked in driveway






Picture 3&4: ■ concord front lawn and driveway & ■ forest lane side/external yard.



Picture 5&6: [redacted] concord front lawn and driveway & [redacted] forest lane side/external yard (different view showing slope, grading, elevation etc.) and front lawn and driveway of [redacted] concord rd. properties.



#### **Appendix A: Transportation Agency of Canada – Sight distance.**

"The Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) manual, states that the sight distance for a minor road with stop control should be at least the "distance traveled in three (3) seconds at design speeds to decision sight distance". For a driveway connection to a public road, it is recommended that the minimum stopping sight distance should be provided since it exceeds the distance traveled in three (3) seconds by a vehicle traveling at the design speed. From a stop-controlled approach, the sight triangles are a function of the vehicle speeds on the major roadway and the crossing or turning departure maneuver of the vehicle leaving from a stopped condition. The TAC sight distances for turning movements from a stop are noted as follows. Required sight distances are dependent upon posted speed limits. Posted speed limits are the white regulatory signs and not the yellow curve advisory signs. Below is a table showing required sight distances for different posted road speed limits."

Posted speed of road – km/h	Required sight distance – meters	Required sight distance – feet
40	85	280
50	105	345
60	130	430
70	150	495
80	170	560

**The sight distance available along Concord Road to the south extend for more than 120 meters (because of the curve), and is limited by the horizontal curvature of the road. Driveways [REDACTED] concord to concord rd. constitutes "Irregular sight triangle"**

"Imagine sitting in your car and you are about to enter the road. You look up and down the road before proceeding. The point where you observe the road is the sight distance. This is important because you need to see approaching traffic and they need to see you." "At locations where sight distance is poor, you may need to clear some of the vegetation to help you achieve the required sight line distance. Remember the vegetation may grow back and you will have to clear it from time to time. It is the responsibility of the access owner to receive permission from the landowner to clear vegetation other than what is needed for the primary access construction."