From: Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 2:58 PM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Subject: Fwd: [External] July 15 2020, Council Meeting Item 3 SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT NO. 33

Communication for Council.

Todd Coles, BES, MCIP, RPP
City Clerk
905-832-8585, ext. 8281 | todd.coles@vaughan.ca
City of Vaughan l Office of the City Clerk
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan ON L6A 1T1
vaughan.ca

From: Richard Lorello <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Maurizio Bevilacqua; Marilyn Iafrate; Tony Carella; Rosanna DeFrancesca; Sandra Racco; Alan Shefman; Gino Rosati; Linda Jackson; Mario Ferri; Todd Coles
Cc: John Troina; Mark Pulciani; Laura Federico; Andre Willi; Bob Moroz; Paola Apollinaro; Daniela Villani; Hatem Abu El-Neel; Monica Guido; Nick Pinto; Maria Verna; David Donnelly; Ileana Battiston; Lucia Pulchani; Silvana Cantalini; Keep Vaughan Green; Flavio Battiston; Nick Angellotti; Grace Angellotti; Noor Javed; John Lancaster; Dina Ibrahim; Adam Martin-Robbins; Josie Fedele; Sergio; Clerks_vaughan.ca; Suzanne Craig
Subject: [External] July 15 2020, Council Meeting Item 3 SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT NO. 33

Good evening Mr. Coles

Please post this communications as it relates to Item 3 of the July 15 Council Meeting.

Good evening Mayor and Members of Council

I have received many emails from residents since the outcome of the July 8 Special Committee of the Whole meeting regarding the proposed Clubhouse Development. As a result of the decision of Council, there is a deep sense of disappointment, betrayal, resentment, disrespect, bias, anger and shock at the manner in which they

were treated. Should Council's decision be upheld on Wednesday July 15th, these sentiments will be become deep seated and long lasting. Aside from Councillor Carella and Councillor Iafrate support on July 8th, Council failed to support an established community of long time residents.

To start, many deputants registered to speak conveying well thought out concerns about the effects that the proposed development will have on their community. Their lawyer, who is paid by these same residents with hard earned personal funds, pointed out several inaccuracies in the staff report. This all fell on deaf ears as Members of Council chose not to direct any questions to the deputants or their lawyer and focused select questions to the applicant's lawyer, all of which failed to fully address any of their concerns. This was very disrespectful after the community waited 2 years to have their request for an ICBL addressed only to be ignored and sidelined on July 8th. Instead, Council engaged only with the applicant which in my opinion digressed into fear mongering of the ICBL request and a irrelevant "Happy Talk" about a potential park and an emergency access.

Several Members of Council, including the Mayor were intent on changing the narrative from the legitimate concerns of the community to a new narrative of an emergency exit and the dedication of park land to the city, neither of which addresses the serious issues articulated by the community. It became apparent that Council has already made their decision to support the applicant at the expense of community concerns.

What came out of the July 8th decision of Council was vague and left many questions unanswered. Such as;

1. The staff report suggested peer reviews of the applicant's reports, yet peer reviews were not part of the July 8 decision
2. There was talk of a task force involving residents and ratepayer groups, yet there was no mention of a task force in the July 8 decision
3. There was talk of the applicant resubmitting revisions, yet there was no scope or timing of those revisions
4. The applicant is requesting that the proposed development be part of the Woodbridge Secondary Plan, yet there is no timing or framework for conducting this review and allow for public input
5. Several flaws in the staff report and the traffic study were identified but not addressed
6. The lack of public transit infrastructure to support the proposed development was not addressed
7. Public health concerns such as mental health were raised but not addressed

I could mention many more concerns that were raised and not addressed. In the absence of and ICBL, Council has an obligation to this community to layout a plan and timing to address the numerous concerns. It is still widely preferred to use the frame work of an ICBL as the correct mechanism to address these concerns and more. Council has nothing to lose and everything to gain by adopting the request of

the community to implement an ICBL.

There is still an opportunity to do so at the July 15th Council meeting and restore confidence in the community that Council is working in the interest of an established community and long-time residents. The application before you is deeply flawed, especially in the area of transportation, environmental sustainability and the long term impact on the surrounding area.

Sincerely
Richard T. Lorello