
**COMMUNICATION – C38
COUNCIL – MAY 18, 2021
Committee of the Whole
Report No. 26, Item 4**

From: Rose Savage <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 11:56:21 AM
To: todd.coles@vaughan.ca <todd.coles@vaughan.ca>
Subject: [External] Velmar Centre Property Limited Official Plan Amendment - May 12, 2021 - Committee of the Whole

Hi Todd,

As per my deputation on May 12, 2021, below is my re-submission from Public Hearing on Sept 17, 2019.

My additional comments to add are as follows:

Given that parkland is a public health necessity, I find it odd that the city would grant the development with anticipated easement to access the site for their development.

Further, \$600,000 in section 37 benefits is low and covered the costs to reinstate the park.

The development should be smaller to meet the required setbacks and frontage.

The frontage setback is required to meet future transit priorities.

The intent of the OP is comprised.

The Planning Report includes many provisions that have to be satisfied in order to proceed with the development. The scale of the development is not aligned with the intent of the area OP and its proximity to the park.

My Deputation - September 17, 2019:

- >
- > Honourable Mayor Maurizio Bevilacqua and members of council.
- >
- > I'm Rose Savage and I'm speaking as an owner and tax payer in Weston Downs.
- >
- > We request that the City of Vaughan REJECTS this application. This application is not appropriate within the Weston Downs Community.
- >
- > The intensification corridor is east of Rutherford not west. Close to subway !
- >
- > The commercial service plaza is a C3 local commercial zone with a 20,000 square feet allowance only.
- >
- > They do not have a right for any residential.
- >
- > Who decided in the first place that 4 storey is appropriate?
- >
- > Respecting the appropriateness, accessibility and compatibility as follows:
- >
- > The proposed Development DOES NOT conform to the maximum building height and FSI policies of the Vaughan Official Plan - VOP 2010.
- >
- > The proposed Development will negatively impact Velmar Downs Park. The proposed setbacks do not meet the minimum requirements.
- >
- > A wind/sun/shade study is required.
- >
- > CPTED (Crime Prevention through environmental design) and Safety Audit are requested. The principles need to be met.
- > A) natural surveillance
- > B) natural access control
- > C) Territorial reinforcement
- > D) maintenance
- >
- > It does not propose an appropriate built form, building elevations and materials, site design, enhanced landscaping, and interface with Velmar Downs Park.
- >
- > The relationship of the building setbacks, height and design with the immediate area is inadequate.
- >
- > The existing commercial plaza serves a community need. The existing C3 Local Commercial Zone should be protected.
- >
- > The proposed parking is inadequate and will overflow onto the neighbourhood streets.

- >
- > Pedestrian and accessibility safety have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- >
- > Integration of the Development with the existing community does not conform to the needs of the community.
- >
- > The proposed density is inconsistent with the existing zoning and character of the existing neighbourhood. The neighbourhood consists of low density single detached dwellings. The Development is out of scale and will change the character of the area.
- >
- > Site circulation, proper vehicular access and turning movements, including service vehicles such as fire and garbage trucks are inadequate.
- >
- > Provision of sufficient snow storage area is inadequate.
- >
- > Implementation of appropriate waste collection design standards, stormwater management, and site servicing and grading is required. How does this address infrastructure requirements ie proximity to a school (not in walking distance), capacity of the school, impact on fire with more units, and no community centre or other amenity. Infrastructure is more than water and sewer.
- >
- > Respecting Weston Downs Community's Urban Design Standards as follows:
- >
- > A traffic study request should consider the current 12,000 vehicles/day with a projected 10 year outlook. Traffic infiltration went up from 6,000 vehicles to 12,000 within 6 years. Knowing this issue and allowing a dramatic increase of additional traffic contributes to an already chaotic community entrance with known accidents involving the safety of children in the community.
- >
- > Proposal does not align and is in violation with the VOP2010 and the region plan which raises questions about the integrity of the complete application. The proposal asked to be treated as a low rise structure despite meeting definitions and specifications of a mid rise which is not appropriate.
- >
- > Even with the accommodation of a low rise definition, it fails to meet appropriate building codes and asks for further accommodations which is inappropriate. The community has overwhelmingly indicated the lack of support for the proposal as it does not meet the service, support and planning expectations of the city for which we pay taxes for.
- >
- > You are being asked to violate your own rules with the numerous violations brought forward for your approval. Respect Weston Downs and the residents that live in it. Our community is in disagreement with it. Why enforce on a Community a proposal inconsistent with your own city plans and which has no
- > Community support.
- >
- > RA2 with RA5 allowances will begin deconstructing our community into a developer's paradise and community nightmare; perception and optics show this and we feel this intensification is not appropriate for Weston Downs Community as a whole.

>

> Applicant is requesting medium density when Weston Downs is zoned for low density; that's not appropriate.

>

> This application is not environmentally, accessibility or CPTED friendly.

>

> Cutting the curb on the opposite side of proposed Development and widen the entrance in order to accommodate the additional traffic is taking away land from Weston Downs and violates the respect for existing community. Weston Downs Urban Design Guidelines have not been adhered to as evidenced by this application and the inadequate care of our landscaping.

>

> We want to protect our water source as stated by TRCA's report with the vulnerability in our area.

>

> There were 66 submissions in report provided by planning Dept and the vast majority were negative.

>

> We request that the City of Vaughan adheres to the Urban Design Guidelines for the entire community from Langstaff to Rutherford and from Weston Road to the abutting neighbourhoods at Pine Valley;

> Weston Downs in its entirety.

>

> I would like to end by paraphrasing what John F Kennedy said; Ask not what your community can do for you, but what you can do for your community. Every accomplishment starts with the discussion to try. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest form of appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them. Do what's right and just by respecting and supporting the residents of Weston Downs Community and your own OPA24, Bylaw-188, Vaughan Official Plan and York Region Official Plan.

>

> Thank you,

> Rose Savage