

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Britto, John](#)
Subject: FW: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 9:36:37 AM

**Communication : C16
Committee of the Whole (2)
February 9, 2021
Item # 5**

From: Robert A Kenedy [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 07, 2021 8:41 PM
To: Council@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: Furio Liberatore [REDACTED]; Mackenzie Ridge Rate Payers Association <mackenzieridgerpa@gmail.com>
Subject: [External] Re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE

Mayor Bevilacqua and Members of Council,

Re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE

I am writing to register my objection to Item #5 on the Agenda for Committee of the Whole dated Tuesday, February 9 at 1 PM re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE VICINITY OF DUFFERIN STREET AND RUTHERFORD ROAD.

Dufferin Vistas is asking Council to waive the requirement for a two-year pause on minor variance applications, so they can build bigger, taller houses with two-car garages – when they had already signed a deal with the City regarding roof height, building depth and garages.

The Staff report is recommending the exemption. I Object to item 5 on the agenda for the following reasons:

The application for the minor variance should not be up for discussion as the modifications are not minor. This application is re zoning a residential area. This application will affect 32 homes that back onto other residential homes and a critical wildlife corridor connecting two Significant Woodlands on the Oak Ridges Moraine.

There is no need to add 2 meters to the height of a house; this is almost the equivalent to adding a full storey (3 metres). Changing the setbacks to allow for construction of bigger homes and garages on smaller lots is not beneficial for the

community. These additions will infringe on the privacy of the abutting lots and reduce greenspace.

The City of Vaughan Planning Dept should have notified the Residents before making their recommendation. These types of decisions shouldn't be made without the input of Residents. These types of acts are leading the residents to believe that the City of Vaughan Planning Staff are not being truly transparent with the planning process and are disregarding residents' input. These acts are not including public input and public engagement.

In early 2018, the City and Toronto Region Conservation Authority reached an agreement with Dufferin Vistas on a site specific zoning by-law amendment, after conducting secret negotiations with the developer. The roof heights, single-car garages and building depth were all part of the deal! Now, the developer wants to make more money, at our expense. Our lawyer says Council should only grant this exemption if the variances requested are necessitated by "unanticipated" circumstances. There is nothing unanticipated to consider, Staff didn't mention it in their report. The Ontario Municipal Board issued its zoning decision in 2018 – nearly three years ago!

This application has been in process for years. The residents that back onto this property have invested endless hours and are on record for correspondence requests involving this application.

The Applicant has not met the requirements as per LPAT PL160978 Decision dated October 26, 2018. There are still outstanding studies and documents that have not been produced. The developer has asked for several extensions for these studies and documents. We are going on two and a half years waiting for these studies.

Why are variances being considered on a decision that has been made at LPAT, and after the developer signed a "deal" with the City?

I am asking that Members of Council defer this decision until the City of Vaughan Planning Dept has notified all residents on record requesting correspondence, so the residents can be included in the planning process.

--

Robert Aaron Kenedy

■ Georgia Cres

Maple, ON L6A 4R2

Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

238 McLaughlin College

York University
4700 Keele Street
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3
CANADA

From: Furio Liberatore [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 5:47 PM
To: city clerks <clerks@vaughan.ca>; Maurizio Bevilacqua <maurizio.bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Regional Councillor Mario Ferri <mario.ferri@vaughan.ca>; Gino Rosati <gino.rosati@vaughan.ca>; Linda Jackson <linda.jackson@vaughan.ca>; Marilyn Iafrate <marilyn.iafrate@vaughan.ca>; tony.carella@vaughan.ca <tony.carella@vaughan.ca>; rosanna.defrancesca@vaughan.ca <rosanna.defrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Sandra Racco <sandra.racco@vaughan.ca>; alan.shefman@vaughan.ca <alan.shefman@vaughan.ca>
Cc: David Donnelly <david@donnellylaw.ca>; Alexandra Whyte <alexandra@donnellylaw.ca>; njaved@thestar.ca <njaved@thestar.ca>; Richard Lorello [REDACTED]; KEEP VAUGHAN GREEN <keepvaughangreen@gmail.com>; Robert A Kenedy [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE

February 5, 2021

Mayor M. Bevilacqua & Council
Vaughan City Hall
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr.
Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

Mayor Bevilacqua and Members of Council,

Re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE
Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND
TRUCK AVENUE

My Name is Furio Liberatore and I reside at [REDACTED] Princess Isabella Court. My family and I have lived here for 11 years.

I am sending this letter to you on behalf of The Friends of Grand Trunk Ravine.

I write to you all today to register our objection to Item #5 on the Agenda for Committee of the Whole dated Tuesday, February 9 at 1 PM re: DUFFERIN VISTAS LTD. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.16.016 DRAFT PLAN

OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-16V001 230 GRAND TRUCK AVENUE VICINITY
OF DUFFERIN STREET AND RUTHERFORD ROAD.

Bottom line, Dufferin Vistas is asking Council to waive the requirement for a two-year pause on minor variance applications, so he can build bigger, taller houses with two-car garages – when they had already signed a deal with the City regarding roof height, building depth and garages.

The Staff report is recommending the exemption. The first thing I thought when I read that was: you've got to be kidding me! I Object to item 5 on the agenda for the following reasons:

The application for the minor variance should not be up for discussion as the modifications are not minor. This application is re zoning a residential area. This application will affect 32 homes that back onto other residential homes and a critical wildlife corridor connecting two Significant Woodlands on the Oak Ridges Moraine;

There is no need to add 2 meters to the height of a house; this is almost the equivalent to adding a full storey (3 metres). Changing the setbacks to allow for construction of bigger homes and garages on smaller lots is not beneficial for the community. These additions will infringe on the privacy of the abutting lots, and reduce greenspace.

The City of Vaughan Planning Dept should have notified the Residents before making their recommendation. These types of decisions shouldn't be made without the input of Residents. These types of acts are leading the residents to believe that the City of Vaughan Planning Staff are not being truly transparent with the planning process, and couldn't care less about residents and their opinions. These acts are suppressing public input and public engagement.

Sometime in early 2018, the City and Toronto Region Conservation Authority reached an agreement with Dufferin Vistas on a site specific zoning by-law amendment, after conducting secret negotiations with the developer. The roof heights, single-car garages and building depth were all part of the deal! Now, the developer wants to make more money, at our expense. Our lawyer says Council should only grant this exemption if the variances requested are necessitated by "unanticipated" circumstances. There is nothing unanticipated to consider, Staff didn't mention it in their report. The Ontario Municipal Board issued its zoning decision in 2018 – nearly three years ago!

This application has been in process for years. The residents that back onto this property have invested endless hours and are on record for correspondence requests involving this application.

The Applicant has not met the requirements as per LPAT PL160978 Decision dated October 26, 2018. There are still outstanding studies and documents that

have not been produced. The developer has asked for several extensions for these studies and documents. We are going on two and a half years waiting for these studies.

Why are variances being considered on a decision that has been made at LPAT, and after the developer signed a “deal” with the City?

I am asking that Members of Council defer this decision until the City of Vaughan Planning Dept has notified all residents on record requesting correspondence, so the residents can be included in the planning process.

Thank you,

Furio Liberatore

p:

e: