
From: Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Subject: FW: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Communication for CW(2)

From: al.grossi @ [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 3:01 PM
To: Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED]; Kiru, Bill <Bill.Kiru@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; DeFrancesca; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Harnum, Jim <Jim.Harnum@vaughan.ca>
Subject: RE: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

So this is very troubling. You reference these documents but provide no indication of a clear framework or methodology on how you and the team make a decision.

Baring that it's totally left up to human judgement. I would expect something like this:

VOP 2010 Plan (Binding legislation)		4010 Proposal	Pass	Fail	Comments
Number of Stories	4	6		X	50% over Official plan
FSI	1.5	2.7		X	80% higher density than allowed by Official Plan
Zoning NC				X	In conjunction with number of floors this proposal falls

					outside of allowed use
Set-back	14 m from Rutherford Road	0		X	
Sewer Loads		Sump pumps needed below parking structure		X	Not sure original sewers were designed to take load from 135 units constrained in this parcel of land
Traffic Increases				X	At an FSI of 2.7 this block will contains about 8% of the residents of the whole of Weston downs
Amenity areas			X		

I hope I can see a clear pathway or framework like this in the submitted report. It seem to continue to be an arbitrary process. I will also make this clear in a following e-mail to council.

Al

From: Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>

Sent: April 29, 2021 2:36 PM

To: Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED] Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Kiru, Bill <Bill.Kiru@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Nadia Magarelli'

[REDACTED] Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; 'Nick Ciappa'

[REDACTED] 'Rob Salerno'

[REDACTED] 'DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>' <DeFrancesca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>

Subject: RE: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Dear Mr. Grossi

Thank you for your email.

The document framework that will be used to review the applications is the Provincial Policy Statement, The Provincial Growth Plan, the York Region Official Plan; City of Vaughan Official Plan, the City's Zoning By-law and applicable Urban Design Guidelines. The reports/studies (for example the servicing study, etc., submitted in support of the applications (available on the City's website at <https://maps.v Vaughan.ca/planit/>) will be reviewed by the relevant disciplines at the City and commenting agencies (e.g. York Region).

Sincerely,

Mauro Peverini, BAA, MCIP, RPP
Chief Planning Official

905-832-8585 ext. 8407 | mauro.peverini@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | Development Planning Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1
www.v Vaughan.ca



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 11:59 AM
To: Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED] Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Kiru, Bill <Bill.Kiru@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED] 'Victor Lacaria' [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 'Nadia Magarelli' [REDACTED] Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; 'Nick Ciappa' [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 'Rob Salerno' [REDACTED] DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Tamburini, Nancy <Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca>
Subject: RE: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Mr. Todd Coles et al (and Ms. DeFrancesca),

I had asked Mr. Peverini to document as extracted from and highlighted in yellow below:
“Would it be too much to ask that you and your team document the exact approval framework that is used to make these determinations with a focus on eliminating any ambiguity? I would expect an if-this-then-that decision process as it pertains to density, number of floors, sewer loads, traffic infiltration, and any other items that are pertinent”. That way all ambiguity is eliminated and projects are only approved if they check all the boxes.”

It is disconcerting that a formal request of this type go unanswered yet a submission to council for this site is scheduled to be delivered next week, May 7, 2021. I was

trying to understand that if this application is approved by the planning department then we would have a reference on how they arrived at that decision based on a physical and formal artifact that aligns to the approved plans and laws currently in place and that apply to the site (4101 Rutherford).

Mr. Coles, as the city clerk I continue to put this request in the public record and ask that this matrix I've requested be provided in advance of report presentation to council and with sufficient time to absorb it so we can determine if it aligns to current enacted laws and legislation. Once confirmed we can confirm that the framework is accurate and in alignment with current laws then we can use it to assess the approval or denial of the application for this site. I believe my request was made early enough in the process that the document would be provided by now.

In the absence of filling my request in a timely fashion I would suggest that it will impact the presentation to council and as such would expect it to be delayed.

Al Grossi

From: Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>
Sent: March 26, 2021 11:00 AM
To: [REDACTED]; Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Kiru, Bill <Bill.Kiru@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED] 'Victor Lacaria' [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]; 'Nadia Magarelli' [REDACTED] Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; 'Nick Ciappa' [REDACTED] 'Rob Salerno' [REDACTED]
Cc: Tamburini, Nancy <Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>
Subject: RE: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Al,

I understand the Velmar Centre Property Limited applications will be considered at the April 13th Committee of the Whole(2) meeting. This is a change from the tentative timing of April 7th. The meeting on April 13th is scheduled for 1:00pm.

The deadline to submit written comments or a ["Request to Speak"](#) form is 12:00 noon on Monday, April 12th. The agenda for the meeting, which includes the staff report for these applications, will be

published [online](#) by end-of-day on Tuesday, April 6th. I encourage you to continue to participate in the planning process by reviewing the staff report when it is available and submitting your written comments and/or making a virtual deputation at the meeting.

With respect to your question about receiving a response to your enquiry below, I note that you did submit it to Mauro Peverini. I am sure Mr. Peverini, or one of his team members, will be in touch with you.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

Todd

Todd Coles, BES, ACST(A), MCIP, RPP
City Clerk
905-832-8585, ext. 8281 | todd.coles@vaughan.ca

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



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 25, 2021 6:13 PM
To [REDACTED]; Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Kiru, Bill <Bill.Kiru@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; [REDACTED] 'Victor Lacaria' [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] 'Nadia Magarelli' [REDACTED]; Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; 'Nick Ciappa' [REDACTED] 'Rob Salerno' [REDACTED]; Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Tamburini, Nancy <Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Hi Todd,

I understand that you are the city clerk and can enter this into the official record. Want to ensure that the objections raised earlier continue with the re-submission.

Can you also let me know who and when will be responding. Hopefully it before the April 7th report presentation date.

I'm also open to a further call to discuss if that's easier.

Thanks,

Al

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: March 24, 2021 9:06 PM
To: mauro.peverini@vaughan.ca; bill.kiru@vaughan.ca; carmela.marrelli@vaughan.ca;
[REDACTED] 'Victor Lacaria' [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; 'Nadia Magarelli' [REDACTED] mark.antoine@vaughan.ca;
'Nick Ciappa' [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] 'Rob Salerno' [REDACTED];
'"Coles, Todd"' <todd.coles@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca; Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca
Subject: 4101 Rutherford Road Application resubmission

Hi Mauro and others on the video call on Wednesday, March 23, 2021, 10:30-12:00,

First please allow me to thank you and the city staff for making the time in your schedules to meet with us. I'm sure you can appreciate that we are a determined group focused on persevering our community and way of life. I sure that the city can appreciate our combined position as will work to serve our community needs. I'm writing this note to gain some clarity on items I heard on the call to ensure that I clearly understand the sometimes cumbersome and disjointed process that may have been exacerbated with the COVID 19 impacts on council meetings and public input requests. I've also copied my WDRA colleagues as input but this letter is from me personally.

I heard at the meeting that the application had been re-submitted with minimal changes and that the city had heard no objections to the new application. I want you to clarify that the objections to the original submission continue with the resubmission and that they did not have to be re-submitted with each new application. I stand firm that the objections raised by the community and me are still applicable to the new application and that the city will work diligently to see that the report due to be released on April 7 will have an itemized list of how the new application addresses the community concerns if the application should lean towards approval of the application. Furthermore, although the WDRA got notice of the refiling, I have yet to receive any communications via email or Canada Post on this location. Being four streets over from the location the city had indicated that mailings would be going out on any changes. You can appreciate busy schedules, and I now find myself in a last-minute reactionary position. Finally, on this topic,

the WDRA did in fact meet with Councillor DeFrancesca and her assistant Ms. Tamborini to voice objection to the re-submission. Procedurally, I hope that the meeting and the continued objections made it to you, your team, and continue on the official record and continue to apply to the re-submission. If you need confirmation of the meeting, please refer to the attached email and please reach out to Councillor DeFrancesca and her assistant Ms. Tamborini.

You also mentioned on the call that the VOP 2010 although in a draft mode that sections are actually approved and only portions are in dispute thus it remains in the draft state even after 11 years. We need to fix that issue. I believe that a new VOP plan will be submitted and put in place before the 2010 one gets approved. We will keep going from draft to draft with nothing ever being fully approved. I then ask, how can one use this broken process to support any decision-making framework. Also, I understand that bylaws need to be changed for this to progress and that also never happens. The city continues to plow forward with a sometimes draft plan and contravening its own bylaws since they are not updated properly and, from the comments on the call are maybe 10 years behind as well. If you allow me a moment of being flippant, I have to ask, is the city then actually breaking the law moving this forward under the existing bylaws. My point is, what concrete decision reference points do we use in these matters when plans are in draft and existing bylaws actually prohibit the type of building being proposed. **Would it be too much to ask that you and your team document the exact approval framework that is used to make these determinations with a focus on eliminating any ambiguity? I would expect an if-this-then-that decision process as it pertains to density, number of floors, sewer loads, traffic infiltration, and any other items that are pertinent. That way all ambiguity is eliminated and projects are only approved if they check all the boxes.** The nebulousness under which these decisions are perceived to be made is frustrating on both sides.

Finally, I have also heard from the WDRA that a representative of the builders may have reached out to indicate that there is further room for negotiations. I will ask whoever had that conversation to reply to this email to provide some context. If this is the case, I believe I and we would be open to sitting down with them and continue the discussion. Please note that the WDRA has in fact been trying to have a dialogue but until the call this week they indicated to me that they have been unable to get them to the table. If the outreach is confirmed I propose that we delay the presentation to the council on April 7 until the outreach plays out to a conclusion.

As a resident of Vaughn, I really do appreciate the job you are trying to do and

look forward to keeping the channels of communications open.

Look forward to your reply.

Al Grossi

This e-mail, including any attachment(s), may be confidential and is intended solely for the attention and information of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify me immediately by return e-mail and permanently delete the original transmission from your computer, including any attachment(s). Any unauthorized distribution, disclosure or copying of this message and attachment(s) by anyone other than the recipient is strictly prohibited.