

Communication : C 8
Special Committee of the Whole
October 13, 2021
Agenda Item # 1

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 9:52 AM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: oprmanager@vaughan.ca
Subject: [External] City Of Vaughan Official Plan Review

To whom it may concern. I submit the following as an electronic deputation for Public Meeting of Wednesday Oct. 13/21 at 7pm.

When I read the article in the Vaughan Citizen paper regarding the review of the City of Vaughan official plan, the first thought that came to mind was the numerous committee of the whole meetings that my neighbours and I attended where **there was no enforcement** of the **existing official plan**. I have the same question now, **what value will the revision have if not enforced?**

I have attached one of my past deputations to help drive my point home.

So I am really interested to see how this revision will change things.

What I would like to see in a nut shell:

- Remove ambiguous grey areas open for unfair interpretation.
- If there are requirements such as a 90 degree angle – that it must be a requirement around the **entire** perimeter of the land, not just apply to one side!
- That whatever is being proposed is within character of the established area.....so a 12 storey building should not be next door to a single residential bungalow?
- If there is going to be 160 units in a building then make sure there are 160 visitor parking spaces within that project too.....there have been far too many residential streets turned into parking lots without any regard to the ramifications that existing residents end up having to bear.
- The town to realize that not all intersections are similar. Kipling and Hwy 7 intersection doesn't resemble any other major intersection along HWY 7, stop treating it like it does. (Kipling does not open on to Steeles it is a dead end)
- Looking back at lessons learned to-date and adopt best practices.
- **Enforcing the official plan** before accepting proposals to move forward – demonstrate that there is value in having an official plan; therefore, if the plan states **only 4 stories** for a building, **then it should be only 4 stories!**

In revising the official plan, what I really would like to see is a revision in the entire process for accepting applications from developers.

- Do not allow proposals to move forward if they don't even remotely meet the official plan requirements!
- Stop applications that require several revisions and amendments, this pretty much translates that something isn't jiving.
- Township do the right thing well before having numerous committee of the whole meetings in order to get a project approved. We need to be putting tax payers money to better use rather than calling numerous meetings.
- Stop applications from making it so far that it is so obvious that it should have been declined from inception.
- There needs to be better communication on developments.

As mentioned in my deputation attached, The City needs to be **more innovative** in steering developers to build on lands that are already zoned for commercial multi mid high development to include multi residential, not cutting into existing well established residential neighbourhoods. There are **extensive blocks** of one storey commercial spaces spreading across **miles of HWY 7** that should be a focus of the future multi mid-high-rise development. Create incentives to have owners of these properties consider restructuring/adding additional stories.

Thank you, V. Spizzirri

919819 Ontario Ltd. & 1891445 Ontario Inc.
 File No. OP.18.008 & Z.18.013
 Owner: 919819 Ontario Ltd. & 1891445 Ontario Inc.
 Location: 5217 & 5225 Highway 7, 26 & 32 Hawman Avenue

Good day panel. My name is Vicky Spizzirri and I live on [REDACTED] Hawman Ave one of the oldest streets in Woodbridge for the past 15 years and another 15 on Veneto.

I am speaking today in opposition to the proposal that 919819 Ontario Ltd. has brought forward and like every other resident attending today, we are hoping to achieve one thing and that **council will do the right thing!** Reject this proposal!

The Vaughan Official Plan 2010 states:

The subject lands are designated: low Rise Residential, which permits single detached, semi-detached, town house units and public or private institutional buildings to a maximum building height of 3 storeys on only one of the lots.

We oppose the rezoning and the proposal of a 12 Storey building as it doesn't remotely meet any of the requirements of the VOP.

This proposal is not in line with the VOP that maintains that in community areas with established development, new development must "be designed to respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area."

No matter what the colour of the bricks, shape and design of a building, a 12-storey building is not and never will be a characteristic of the area it is proposed to sit on.

Counsel> What is the value in having an official plan, if you are not enforcing it?

In fact, "The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines state that the City will reinforce the City's Official Plan policies", it goes on to say, providing a clear vision and supporting directions for high quality and context-sensitive development within Intensification Areas **while protecting Stable Areas** through thoughtful transitions and compatible infill that **respects the character of established neighborhoods.**"

We oppose the rezoning and the entire proposal as it doesn't meet any of these guidelines. A reiterate a 12-storey building does not respect the character of the established neighbourhood!

Counsel> What is the value in your guideline statement if you are not enforcing it?

I believe that my neighbours have done a great job of outlining the reasons for the objection to this proposal. I want to take this opportunity to remind all the councillors of the meeting of the whole (Public Hearing) June 14, 2019 when the initial application was presented by the developer, referring to the Quote from Vaughan citizen paper dated June 13, 2019 "Coun. Marilyn lafrate dubbed the proposal as "preposterous" and said that it will set the precedent for other developers to pitch for in some of their so-called bold ideas": "In addition, they quote her saying "this is high density development infiltration of the **worst kind** into a stable older, established neighbourhood – a community which has existed for half a century. Councillors Rosati and DeFrancesca expressed the same sentiments.

The same Vaughan Citizen article mentions that in an email to York Region Media, "Coun Sandra Yeung Racco is surprised as to why this app was in front of us, as the application is so out of place".

She couldn't have said it any better. As citizens of this City, we ask **why isn't there a more robust and constructive process in place to weed out the number of applications that are absurd like this one and the one before this, that do not meet any of the guidelines that the City has put into place or the Vaughan Official Plan? Why are they making it to this point?** Please let's put tax payer's money to better use.

This proposal has gone from 16 storeys to 12 storeys, From a full exit and entrance on Hawman Ave., one of the oldest historic streets in Woodbridge to a temporary access until another could be secured elsewhere like Kipling Ave. **Neither Hawman or Kipling** avenues should have ever been a part of this proposal in the first place as they are in no way part of any intensification planand excluding them which is the right thing to do, doesn't in anyway diminish our objection of a 12-storey building.

How many amendments must this proposal go through until it is obvious to everyone that we are trying to fit a square peg into a round whole?

Please do the right thing and reject this proposal. Set the right precedent moving forward. It will echo: That councillors are enforcing the City-wide Urban design guidelines and Vaughan Official Plan That councillors are listening to their constituents who elected you to represent them and deliver a message that Intensification doesn't mean a blank cheque for developers.

The City needs to be **more innovative** in steering developers to build on lands that are already zoned for commercial multi mid high development to include multi residential, not the other way around.

There are extensive blocks of one storey commercial spaces spreading across miles of HWY 7 that should be a focus of the future multi mid-high-rise development, **not the 2 residential lots located at 5217 & 5225 Hwy #7!**

pls DO THE RIGHT THING!