

Co

---

**From:** info@villageofwoodbridge.ca <info@villageofwoodbridge.ca>

**Sent:** December 14, 2020 10:44 AM

**To:** Council@vaughan.ca; Harnum, Jim <Jim.Harnum@vaughan.ca>; Spensieri, Nick <Nick.Spensieri@vaughan.ca>; Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Marrelli, Carmela <Carmela.Marrelli@vaughan.ca>; Clerks@vaughan.ca; Coles, Todd <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>

**Cc:** Fera, Eugene <EUGENE.FERA@vaughan.ca>

**Subject:** [External] PROPOSED CITY PARK DEVELOPMENT - CONCERNS

For the public record the Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association would like it duly documented that on Tuesday, December 8th we participated in the Committee of the Whole Meeting regarding report #61 City Park (Woodbridge Gates North) Inc.

For awareness, we have copied by BCC the Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association members.

We request the City Manager and Commissioner of Planning to address the following two procedural concerns:

a) Madame Chair arbitrarily changed the order of presentations by asking the residents to present their deputations prior to the Developer. By allowing the Developer to speak after the residents, this did not give us the opportunity to dispute some of the false statements made by the Developer. For example a misrepresentation was made, falsely stating that at the October 2020 meeting, this project met all Heritage Guidelines. This is not true.

b) City Councillors did not address concerns regarding the adherence to the Ontario Heritage Act. Under the Ontario Heritage Act, heritage district guidelines are meant to supersede planning rules. Why is Vaughan not adhering to these OHA principals, and why are staff not being advised to adhere to the letter and the spirit of the OHA rules? In particular, Section 41.2 (1) (a) and (b) and Section 41.2 (2).

In addition, the following concerns were raised through deputations and there was no courteous acknowledgement of these concerns by Councillors.

a) This application fails to align with setbacks as approved with the most recent applications in the Village.

b) This application fails to meet setback guidelines as documented in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan.

c) Current residents will be adversely affected by the noise and vibrations of a 7m crash wall. The Developer stated that no noise mitigation would be provided to the neighbours to the north and east of this proposed development. Who will address the concerns of these residents?

d) Section 37 Bonusing Agreements do not enhance the community and no community input was sought.

e) The Developer did nothing to address issues concerning safety, shadowing and the removal of trees as expressed by the resident immediately to the north of the proposed building.

f) This application is fraught with numerous variances which is an indicator of a proposed development that is too large trying too hard to fit into a space that is too small.

The Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association is also concerned with the traffic, parking and pedestrian safety issues that this development will create once it begins. We are requesting that a construction management plan be provided prior to the onset of this project so that we can share with our association members.

The Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association is not opposed to development. We just ask for development that is appropriate and sympathetic to the Woodbridge Village Core.

It is disappointing that we do not see any effective challenge by elected

City Councillors to express the consistent concerns raised by their constituents and voiced by the Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association.

And although City Councillors have the authority to accept development applications with exaggerated expectations, such as this one, it does not mean that these applications are right!

Sincerely,  
The Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association