

**Communication : C 58**  
**Committee of the Whole (1)**  
**November 30, 2021**  
**Agenda Item # 2**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [John Britto](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Board of Trade Golf Course Development  
**Date:** Monday, November 29, 2021 1:53:04 PM

---

lc

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 11:44 AM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** sabrina.houston@adamology.com; ceo@adamology.com  
**Subject:** [External] Board of Trade Golf Course Development

We are dismayed to see the city's cryptic message on the above:

1. Only short notice is given to residents most affected about meetings on the Board of Trade Golf Course Development. You seem to do the absolute minimum that you can get away with in order to fast-track approval for the developer, all at high cost to residents affected.
2. From notices and news alerts, it appears that council has already decided to approve the development; that the December 10 session is a mere formality. Is it?
3. Many residents, including the undersigned, paid very hefty premiums to buy homes that back on to the golf course. Two realtors with decades of experience in the neighborhood have advised that homes on Wycliffe Ave. demanded premiums ranging from \$100,000 to \$140,000 for homes that enjoy the peace, quiet and view of the golf course. Most of us moved from high density areas, paid up to live in a green area. The premium mentioned above varied on factors such as lot size. Will the city offer compensation for the very real loss that will be suffered by residents affected? If not, is the city prepared for legal actions, including class actions, against the city for the significant loss in home values?
4. At some meetings, issues discussed included a tree-lined border — a tree buffer— that would back onto the existing mature neighborhoods at the north or south of the development. The city *will* be sued for loss that affected residents will undoubtedly incur.
5. There were supposed to be *independent* traffic studies on the impacts the *much* higher density would cause. These were identified at various meetings to be significant and severe. The proposed amendments to intersections have still not been confirmed. It is clear the city has no plans, no idea, on how to alleviate the significantly higher traffic burden. Not only has the previously proposed density *not* been reduced, it appears that plans proposed have even higher density. You now add to already brutal injuries to residents.
6. The lot sizes proposed are wholly inconsistent with existing homes in the community. Many if not most homes will have 2 to 4 homes backing onto their lots— significant reduction in value of affected homes.

With reference to the virtual meeting proposed, council has selected a time when almost everyone is at work. Is this intentional? Please ensure the undersigned names are entered for the virtual meeting.

Adam Okhai

████ Wycliffe Ave., L4L3N7

*Adam Okhai*

*Founder & CEO Adamology LLC*

*adamology.com*

*Private Cell #* █████

Business mail: [ceo@adamology.com](mailto:ceo@adamology.com)

Personal email: [adam.okhai@gmail.com](mailto:adam.okhai@gmail.com)

There are several undisclosed recipients

:ao: