

**From:** Rajbir Singh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 04, 2021 8:22 AM  
**To:** DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Ferri, Mario <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Rosati, Gino <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Jackson, Linda <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; Racco, Sandra <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Shefman, Alan <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; Integrity Commissioner <Integrity.Commissioner@vaughan.ca>; Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca; DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca; Antoine, Mark <Mark.Antoine@vaughan.ca>; Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Harnum, Jim <Jim.Harnum@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] Opposition to 4101 Rutherford Road Development

As a frustrated resident of Weston Downs, I am writing this email to once again oppose the proposed development at 4101 Rutherford Road in Vaughan.

This project does not fit the existing character of the neighbourhood. The issues I find with these proposed development are extensive, here are some key points.

Properties are developed with main buildings that occupy lots either at the front of the lot or the central portion with large front/rear yard setbacks and at minimum double driveways that can accommodate parking for up to at least 4 vehicles. Ancillary features form part of the main building (such as an attached garage) and are not detached and varied in position. In all instances they are attached to the main building as well as being situated a modest distance away from the street and with consistent side and/or rear yards. The ancillary structures are generally subordinate to the main dwelling. The neighbourhood is stable and is not experiencing reinvestment and regeneration in the form of new lots or replacement dwellings.

Traffic studies have already pointed to problems within the current Infrastructure in the Weston Downs Community. Children's lives are at risk currently when excessive traffic and that is during a Global Pandemic with a Provincial Lockdown. More residents will only increase this problem. The development will also add to street parking in the surrounding areas and make traffic even worse and a hazard to children going to the neighbourhood park.

Planning staff provided no review or analysis of the requested variances or the subject site's context. Furthermore, the variance proposal is inconsistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and does not conform to the Growth Plan. Furthermore, the proposed variance request may generate site specific implications for any policy

matter of Provincial and/or Regional and/or Municipal government interests such as road widening or neighbourhood capital improvements in the future.

The Neighbourhood's policies require replication of existing physical character, and provide that new developments should fit the general physical patterns of the Weston Downs community. The proposed structure position, height, scale and massing does not reflect a low-rise nature that fits in well with the surroundings. The Vaughan Official Plan and Provincial Policy Statement places an emphasis on new development respecting and reinforcing the physical characteristics of buildings, streetscapes and open space patterns in the neighbourhood. The proposed structure variances adversely impacts the uniform nature and character of neighbouring homes and the site development of the neighbourhood. The proposal does not adequately address the built form policies of the community and generates numerous unacceptable impacts such as privacy, traffic infiltration, overlook and shadowing on both public and private properties.

We have heard that the developer knows of a positive staff report and has now walked away from negotiating with the community in regards to building aesthetics, set backs, mass, height and FSI. This is disconcerting and a flagrant disregard for the planning process which must be transparent and impartial.

What I find very upsetting is a report that has been circulating from a Toronto Star news story.

It is extremely disconcerting to understand that the only reason the charges in that case did not move forward (As referenced in this link [Former Vaughan mayor Jackson cleared of election charges | CP24.com](#) ) was that Vaughan council hadn't acted within the prescribed 30 days. As the article states:

"In a Newmarket, Ont., court on Friday, a judge quashed the remaining charges and stayed proceedings against Jackson because Vaughan council hadn't acted on a compliance audit application within the 30 days required by the act."

The optics in this case are extremely troubling. Either this miss by council was a total breakdown and disregard of their fiduciary responsibilities or one of convenience to protect one of their own. If the latter is the case then the COI would taint any and all council members in office at the time and who are voting on the present proposed development. We would expect that they will recuse themselves from any votes in council that pertain to this builder and/or supported in a state while in conflict by the primary council member.

As stated in the current COI legislation:

**"3. Members are expected to perform their duties of office with integrity and**

**impartiality in a manner that will bear the closest scrutiny.”**

Furthermore, the said member, within earshot, has publicly stated support for the application at 4101 Rutherford Road and has been actively lobbying other council members to vote in the affirmative. The entire process already seems to be cast in a negative light and the integrity commissioner, copied on this email, should take immediate note.

Clearly, interactions with this builder and some members of council will not pass the “closest scrutiny test”.

A formal complaint will be filed should the parties in conflict not recuse themselves as expected.

As a concerned citizen and one who believes in an open, and transparent process, I ask that you address the concerns I have raised in this official submission in a timely manner that would not limit or constrain the community’s ability to comment. More often than not, I find that the council process puts us in a position to react negatively after a decision has already been made. I would also ask that you all insert yourself in this process, and any 4101 Rutherford Road decisions only until the and after the issues raised are addressed to the communities’ satisfaction.

I would like the council to review these points and make a decision that the community overwhelmingly wants. I don't understand how a packed city hall with frustrated residents back in 2019 that were 99% in opposition to this project is not enough to show what the community wants. I always thought the council is a representative of the community. This ongoing process has betrayed that belief in my eyes.

Signed

Rajbir Singh