

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Bellisario, Adelina](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Opposition to Portside Development Proposal at 10568 Islington Ave., Files Z.17.018 & DA.17.042
Date: November-30-20 9:03:59 AM

From: Carol Gould [REDACTED] a>
Sent: Saturday, November 28, 2020 2:40 PM
To: Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Shefman, Alan <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; Rosati, Gino <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Jackson, Linda <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; Clerks@vaughan.ca; Jeffers, Judy <Judy.Jeffers@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Kathryn Angus [REDACTED]; Carol Gould [REDACTED]; Mark Tatone [REDACTED]; Laura De Faveri <[REDACTED]>; Chris Adamkowski [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Mark Inglis [REDACTED]
Subject: [External] Opposition to Portside Development Proposal at 10568 Islington Ave., Files Z.17.018 & DA.17.042

Honourable Mayor , Council and City Planners,
City of Vaughan
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr.
Vaughan, ON

Dear Mayor, Council and City Planners

Re: Applications for an official plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment

Owner: Portside Development (Kleinburg) Ltd.

File #'s: Z.17.018 and related files DA.17.042

We are homeowners at [REDACTED] Islington Ave., and border on the proposed development at 10568 Islington Ave.

We, our neighbours, and K.A.R.A. strongly object to this second proposal by Portside Developments, which flaunts the V.O.P. and K.N.H.C.D. Plan.

Our major objections are:

A. BUILDING SCALE

1). Structure vastly exceeds the floor space index. At 2,175 sq.M, it surpasses the V.O.P. maximum of 1,498 sq.M by a factor of 50%! Unacceptable!

2) The required front and rear yard setbacks are not met.

3) The building height of 12M exceeds the 9.5 M maximum (on a loophole).

4) At 3 full storeys, and on a bench land overshadowing the adjacent property and Islington Ave., it presents a large, overbuilt mass.

- 5) With a 2.4 M side setback against our property, there is no acceptable transitioning.

B. LANDSCAPE

- 1) The proposal calls for clearcutting all trees in the development.
- 2) Because the overbuilt structure and surrounding parking area take up virtually the whole property, there are now only two small planters and a 1.5 M narrow perimeter ribbon available for planting. Plastic flowers maybe?
- 3) 3 M high perimeter retaining walls and deep excavations for underground parking would kill trees on bordering lands. By our count, we would lose 52 small trees and 12 medium and large trees on our side of the property line.
- 4) The complete loss of all trees on the development and bordering property lines mean the loss of all visual and sound separation.

C. LOSS OF HERITAGE HOUSE

- 1) The proposal calls for the demolition of an 1870's Georgian vernacular house--one of the oldest in Kleinburg.
- 2) By the assessment of Portside's heritage report agent, the house was "identified as a non-contributing property in the K.N.H.C.D. Plan". The Heritage Vaughan Committee needs to walk back that judgment.
- 3) The house is in good restorable shape. City of Vaughan needs to conduct its own unbiased assessment.
- 4) To permit the demolition of this house is sleepwalking into a precedent that will allow developers to destroy any heritage house on Kleinburg's main streets.
- 5) Retaining and restoring the house would reduce the main building's S.F.I. to an acceptable level and give suitable transition to neighbouring properties.

We respectfully request that Vaughan Council reject Portside's proposal in its current form at the Dec 1 meeting.

Yours truly,
Peter and Carol Gould