

From: [Magnifico, Rose](#)
To: [Britto, John](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Official Plan Amendment File: OP.19.011, Zoning By-Law Amendment File: Z.19.033
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:43:35 AM

PH

COMMUNICATION - C71
CW (PH) - July 13, 2020
ITEM # 2

Rose Magnifico
Council / Committee Administrator 905-832-8585, ext. 8030 |
rose.magnifico@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | City Clerk's Office
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1
vaughan.ca



From: Clerks@vaughan.ca <Clerks@vaughan.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Magnifico, Rose <Rose.Magnifico@vaughan.ca>
Subject: FW: [External] Official Plan Amendment File: OP.19.011, Zoning By-Law Amendment File: Z.19.033

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca; Jeffers, Judy <Judy.Jeffers@vaughan.ca>;
DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [External] Official Plan Amendment File: OP.19.011, Zoning By-Law Amendment File: Z.19.033

Hello Ma'am, Sir,

We, Raheleh Niati and Shahab Mirbagheri the owners of property at [REDACTED] Riverside Dr., Woodbridge, ON, L4L 2L3, strongly disagree and oppose with the application from Naiman Consulting regarding Official Plan Amendment File: OP.19.011, Zoning By-Law Amendment File: Z.19.033 for the following reasons:

Item 1.a:

The applicant would like to re-designate a portion of the subject lands from "Natural Areas" to "Low-Rise Residential (2)". We believe the natural

areas belong to the public and the 'Land Use' can not be changed as per request of builders to make more profit out of the Land. We are also living close to the conservation area and we always respect this public right. As per our investigation, TRCA has already reviewed this application and did not approve it, they had 38 comments on this file and the applicant was supposed to implement the comments and revise the development plan before proceeding to the next phase of the application. We will definitely raise the same concerns with TRCA and other responsible organizations to ensure public interest is served in this case.

Item 1.b:

Applicant requested for many deviations to VOP 2010 again to make more profit out of the project which is against public and neighbourhood's interest. Here are some examples:

- Applicant wants to build five story buildings instead of 3.5 stories for the area which is very close to the conservation area/Humber river and also located in a narrow street. This Project with the current design will overpopulate the area and most importantly will damage the nature, as well as taking away the privacy of the residents of Riverside drive. The main reason that we purchased our properties at Riverside drive was to enjoy the beauty of the Humber river and the conservation area.
- Applicant is asking for floor space index (FSI) of 1.39 instead of 0.5 permitted by VOP 2010 again to gain more profit out of the Project. This is against public interest and City regulations.
- Applicant would like to deviate from another city regulation and would like to arrange the five story buildings in a way that it will not provide the front entrances on to a public street. This will be against the architecture of the City and as a result against the public interest. We do not see any reason for this request other than the fact that the proposed arrangement by the applicant will make maximum benefit for them as they will have more units to sell to the people. They can proceed with less units but bigger ones in order to meet the requirement defined in VOP 2010.

Item 2:

Applicant is asking to change the zoning of the land to multiple residential zone and to permit site-specific zoning exceptions which is not defined in City's notice of public hearing. Please provide more details about the exceptions that the applicant requested in their application as these details are important for the public. Changing the zoning to multiple residential zone will also be against the public interest and it will overpopulate the area as mentioned in item 1.b

We have talked to all of our neighbours at riverside drive and they all agree with us that the current application submitted to the City is against the public interest and it will damage the conservation area and City's architecture.

We appreciate if the City of Vaughan officials, specially those who care about the environment and the health of the next generation, put stop on such an application which does not respect the public's interest and also environment and focuses on only the financial aspects/profits of the Project.

Regards,
Raheleh Niati
Shahab Mirbagheri