

VAUGHANWOOD RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION  
■ FOREST CIRCLE COURT  
WOODBRIDGE, ONTARIO  
■

October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021

RE: FILE OP.21.015 & Z.21.026  
My Place on 7 Inc. 4850 Highway 7 & 79 Arrowhead Drive

Good evening Madam Chair, members of Council.

My name is Mary Mauti, I represent the members and residents of The Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association. We are in opposition to this application.

The existing residents of this area cannot support the massive change to their existing mature residential area. This application does not indicate proper planning, it only disturbs a settled existing community.

We have reviewed the reports provided by the city and the applicant's agent and have many concerns.

Height of the building and FSI is double of the existing OP. There is no proper transition area between low rise and mid-rise, this should comply with the FSI and height development standards on Highway 7 at the existing OP of 6 stories as per ROP policies.

Angular plan elevation shown which the applicant provides is from the building to the property across Arrowhead. There is no angular plan elevation from the building to the neighbour to the east or the west which is impacted the most.

Entrance to the garage and loading dock is on Arrowhead Drive. No entrance should be granted onto a settled existing community. This is not intensification. Intensification should be self-serving onto Highway 7 and not having access from a settled existing community. Nor can it be an emergency exit. Arrowhead Drive is not part of the mandate of the provincial legislation of intensification. Understand what you are causing in a settled existing community!

Parking requirements are in deficiency of 104 spots, walkable scale does not support this reduce rate of 1/3 of the units to have designated parking space. Accessible parking spaces size is dictated by OBC, zoning cannot change the minimum dimensions. I would like council to ask a peer review of the parking and traffic.

Lack of amenity space, the site does not have any common outdoor amenity, balcony space only! Not all units have balcony. Staff is asking for 1,000 sq.m. this is 1/3 of the required amenity space.

Lack of setbacks in the front area to below finish grade, underground structure shoring and or tiebacks are required, where will they encroach on Regional Right of Way, Common pathway, abutting neighbours? There is no site plan indicating how this building will be built.

Zero set backs to the rear, front and east side??????????

No landscaping at the front due to zero setback. Zero setback to the east side of building adjacent to a common community pathway. Having a block wall against the neighbour to the east causing shadowing!

North elevation facing existing residents lacks a friendly facade to blend into the existing settled community.

This application does not conform to the urban design built form in a settled existing area of VOIP 2010 respecting compatibility of policy 9.1.2.1, 9.1.2.2 building type, height, scale, setbacks of the building from the street, rear, sideyard in a settled existing community.

Is this proper planning??????????????

Please consider our concerns when completing the technical report.