C116
COMMUNICATION
COUNCIL – October 20, 2021
SP CW- Report No. 48, Item 1

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: Adelina Bellisario
Subject: FW: [External] Re: City Of Vaughan Official Plan Review
Date: October-15-21 9:10:14 AM

From: David Arkell [redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 3:18 PM
To: Vicky & Enzo Spizziri [redacted]>
Cc: Clerks@vaughan.ca; oprmanager@vaughan.ca
Subject: [External] Re: City Of Vaughan Official Plan Review

I agree with you.

On Tue, Oct 12, 2021, 9:52 AM <[redacted]> wrote:

> To whom it many 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