

**Communication : C60  
Committee of the Whole (1)  
November 30, 2021  
Agenda Item # 2**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [John Britto](mailto:John Britto)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Clubhouse Developments Inc. files OP.19.014, Z.19.038 and 19T-19V007  
**Date:** Monday, November 29, 2021 1:53:26 PM

---

lc

---

**From:** Lisa Mannella [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 11:12 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Maurizio Bevilacqua <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Alan Shefman <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; Marilyn lafrate <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Linda Jackson <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; Gino Rosati <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Mario Ferri <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Sandra Yeung Racco <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Tony Carella <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; council@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Clubhouse Developments Inc. files OP.19.014, Z.19.038 and 19T-19V007

November 29, 2021

My name is Lisa Mannella, I am a resident of Vaughan residing at [REDACTED] Waymar Heights Blvd. This letter is to again formally object to the application submitted by Clubhouse Developments Inc: file # OP.19.014, z.19.038 and 19T-19V007. In reading the recent staff report created by the Development Planning Department it is with great disappointment to see that none of the concerns of the citizens were considered and that all requests and amendments of the developer were deemed conforming to the policies of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010.

The amendments to the VOP 2010 requested are large in scale and there are many that are needed to approve this large infill development and there is not one concern or question that has arose in the plans according to the City of Vaughan and I do find that quite concerning. If I am reading this correctly the new By-law enacted 1-2021 will allow further future changes and allowances to the developer 2 years after approval. I would please like clarification as to whether that means that the developer will be able to change building heights, the type of dwellings built, yard set-backs etc., lot sizes without any notice to the surrounding residents and citizens of Vaughan?

Also, on page 48 of the 66 page report it reads “Protect the stable residential neighbourhoods west of Islington Avenue. Preserve their unique built form character: housing with a mature wooded context, spacious front and side-yards, connections to the valley and golf course via the trail system, a coherent mix of architectural styles and house forms”. Then it goes on to state that “the development ensures the protection and preservation of the built form character”. Please are you able to explain that to me, as I am quite certain that the houses being built by Clubhouse Developments will be very similar in design as do all new subdivisions. As well, how is it possible to ensure a mature wooded context when all of the trees will be cut in the south neighbourhood in order to built the 112 proposed houses, and on top of that no tree buffer has been allotted in the south neighbourhood on the side where the houses will be abutting the existing neighbourhood. Having a buffer on the new portion of the development may satisfy the ideas outlined in the VOP for the new development but it does not satisfy the existing residents. Also, spacious front and side-yards may be a little difficult to achieve on 12 to 13.7 M lot frontages. As well, connection to the golf course will be impossible and unachievable as the golf course is being eliminated.

I am voicing my concern to the scale of this development and how it is being approached. The VOP 2010 continuously states that new development must reinforce existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type, orientation, character, form and planned function of the immediate area. I do understand that technically an RD3 designation does fit the criteria in theory, however, it is unfair to say that fitting these sizes of lots and types of homes into a neighbourhood that is designated R1V is at all compatible with the existing neighbourhood and meets any of the criteria accept to simply say that you are building houses beside houses. Therefore, I ask that the size of the lots in the South Neighbourhood, not be approved to the proposed size, they are simply not fitting and buffer requirements should be added to the proposal as well.

This is my deputation from March 2020:

“My husband, son and I reside at [REDACTED] Waymar Heights Blvd. There are many reasons for my objection. I have lived in Woodbridge all my life and for 23 of

the 40 years I have lived on Waymar Heights Blvd. Waymar Heights Blvd is a unique street and in my biased opinion this area is the most beautiful area in Woodbridge. I however am not the only one to agree with the fact that it is truly unique. The designation of Waymar Heights Blvd as R1V (Old Village Residential) proves that you as the Members of Council agree as well that it is truly unique, inclusive of Davidson Drive and Gamble Street. By-Law 1-88 where 6 of the present members of Council were part of that decision is proof of that.

"Lands designated Low Density Residential adjacent to the Board of Trade Golf and Country Club shall be developed for single family residential only and lots abutting the golf course shall be a minimum of 930m<sup>2</sup> (10000 square feet) in area."

The lots on Waymar Heights Blvd are distinguished by plan 4134 and designated R1V with a minimum lot frontage of 30m (100 ft frontage), therefore making them unique.

There have been applications rejected to sever lots on Waymar Heights Blvd due to the sizing of the lots requested. In 2008 an application was submitted to the City (Files OP.07.007 and Z.07.043) to sever two existing lots at the corner of Waymar Heights Blvd and Gamble Street, abutting the Board of Trade Golf Course. The request was to sever # 146 and #160 Waymar Heights Blvd into five residential lots for the purpose of building 5 single family dwellings with lot frontages of 18.28m., 60ft lots. This application was not approved in order to maintain the large lot character of this distinct area. The two lots were later severed to three lots but kept in the parameters and adhered to R1V lot distinction. These actions by Vaughan Council prove that this older established area is unique and deserves to be preserved and I ask that you continue to foster your previous decisions and do the same in dealing with this proposed application. It is simply not right that in the planned south neighborhood 40ft lots be proposed or developed backing on lots preserved by the R1V (Old Village Residential) zoning. This established area characterized by larger lot sizes has been recognized as unique and any future development should protect the integrity of the area and maintain the overall character and the existing lot sizes. I believe that the rules, rules made by our elected

Vaughan Council shall be enforced to all and abided by all. The current residents living on and building homes on Waymar Heights Blvd have adhered to the lot distinction and therefore it should be enforced to all. So tonight, I simply ask you to stick to your current beliefs and enforce your By-laws and enforce your Official Plan. “

I travel everyday to drop my child off to school and it is a very short distance away, however every year it gets more and more difficult to get there with the many cars on the road. I do see that staff have some concern with the traffic in the immediate area of the development and it is good that it has finally been acknowledged as an issue. However, I feel that the solutions to combat traffic brought forth by the developer are simply not enough. Adding a turning lane to Clarence and to Wycliffe is not going to solve the problem of the new 1300 vehicles that will be trying to exit and enter every day. It is already difficult to travel in these areas with the current amount of traffic. This is not something that can be thought of after the approval. The existing streets do not even have the ability for expansion and I do believe creating gridlock in downtown Woodbridge (Woodbridge Avenue, Clarence, Islington and Wycliffe) will have long-term negative effects on our community. The bike trails and walking systems will not help any of this. This is a major issue and no approvals should be made without thorough consideration to this.

Your constituents, the citizens of Vaughan have been fighting this proposed development for years. We have attended protests, submitted letters, written deputations, made phone calls, put in many hours of research, attended meetings both in person and virtually and we have even created groups to keep up this fight. In March of 2020 you had the greatest number of citizens ever opposing a single proposal attend a Committee of the Whole meeting that lasted until past midnight. No one gave up, we waited to have our say. Today we continue to fight, oppose and voice our concerns meaning this is truly important to the citizens of Vaughan. We will continue to disapprove in hopes that our concerns will be heard and that our requests be considered before it is too late and the decisions made will affect our community negatively and for future generations.

Thank you

Lisa Mannella