

C9
COMMUNICATION
COUNCIL – September 27, 2021
CW (PM)- Report No. 41, Item 3

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Adelina Bellisario](mailto:Adelina.Bellisario)
Subject: FW: [External] Official Plan Amendment File OP.21.012 - Woodbridge Park
Date: September-15-21 10:09:24 AM

From: C M [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:53 PM
To: Tony Carella <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Clerks@vaughan.ca; jmcfarlane@westonconsulting.com
Subject: [External] Official Plan Amendment File OP.21.012 - Woodbridge Park

Hi Councillor Carella and Committee of the Whole,

I am writing to you today after having listened to the city council meeting which took place today regarding 5390 Steeles Ave. W. and the developers proposed amendment to the structures to be developed on site.

I live in the adjacent townhome community at 21 Tauton St. and from my experiences while living here over the last 18 months will hopefully give insight into why this proposal should never be accepted.

The community already struggles with parking and narrow laneways, there is never availability for visitor parking and whatever little there may be would almost certainly be taken by people visiting a new 25 storey highrise or retail development associated with it. An issue already apparent in the fact that the proposed parking structure would not even have enough to service the residents of the new building.

The assisted living facility "Woodbridge Vista" on the west side of this plot of land also struggles with parking. More often than not people park illegally on the side of the only entry road to the entire community located off of Steeles. On that note, this single point of entry for this community which already services Woodbridge Vista and the 249 townhome dwellings in this area cannot possibly cope with the additional traffic a 25 storey building and retail development would cause because it already cannot handle what it currently has.

There is a major issue with safety specific to the under developed area at the entry to Saintfield Drive. There is no way for the school bus to enter the townhome community so it stops and waits in the same spot as the people who are unable to park at Woodbridge Vista (illegally on the side of the Rd., which is also the single point of access to the entire community). This creates havoc in early morning rushhour and causes long waits to get out but more importantly it creates an incredibly unsafe environment for children who are forced to walk up Saintfield Drive with no sidewalk or safe waiting area to board the bus. Furthermore, turning left into the community off of an already extremely busy Steeles Ave. with no advanced green light is incredibly dangerous and time consuming. The short narrow left turn lane which serves at best 3 cars and the kink located in

Steeles Rd. at this specific point creates a horrible blindspot when cars opposite east bound traffic are also turning left onto Gihon Springs from Steeles. This is a situation which should have already been prevented but instead of considering this they are looking to add more traffic into this dangerous intersection. Adding more cars turning left into the community during rushhour will cause backups into Steeles Ave.

It is incredulous that this developer wishes to build more before even finishing what they have started and even worse that what they plan will not improve the area but only serve to cram as many dwellings as possible into a very small area without considering the effects on those who purchased townhomes in the community with no knowledge of this.

The response provided by Ms. McFarlane with regards to having conducted a study with an engineer provides zero comfort to any of the issues above. As we all know the space there is cannot be expanded. Roads cannot be widened where there is no more land. Additional signage as suggested will never create additional entries or double the capacity of an already overwhelmed road.

It was also mentioned by Ms. McFarlane that the park which currently exists is not part of their development, rather it is the city's. The park I assume, was required as part of the community development plan, a plan which never included a 25 storey residential building on top of the townhome community. I fail to understand how her response addresses the concern that the park simply cannot handle the additional demand this new structure would cause, because it is already more often than not full of children from our community as it is. It is a public park and should remain accessible to everyone and if a developer wishes to make money then they should enrich the community not only themselves. None of the plans or responses provided by the developer alleviate current issues, infact they will only serve to aggravate them.

I highly encourage you to take a visit to this area to see for yourself the issues which already exist and the potential disasters this development will cause.

Regards,

Chris Meitsch