

**COMMUNICATION C10**  
**ITEM NO. 2**  
**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**  
**(PUBLIC MEETING)**  
**January 18, 2022**

---

**From:** Rose Rubino [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 15, 2022 6:02 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca; Mario Ferri <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Maurizio Bevilacqua <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Marilyn lafrate <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] Application Issues - 1600 Teston Road - Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.21.046 Draft Plan of Subdivision Amendment 19T-17V009

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing you to air the following grievances regarding the above mentioned proposed agreement of 90 units on 1600 Teston Road.

Reasons this is a problematic application:

- 1) We have a signed LPAT agreement of 90 units on 1600 Teston, with a proper storm management pond, and a plan that was based on clear and thoughtful recommendations from the TRCA. The city really should not consider these major changes that are far more than "tweaks" (as the Deputy City Manager of Planning noted) but are major and ones that will lead to a series of cascading changes. In short, the city has a fiduciary function of protecting the public from poor development decisions when an LPAT decision is made. The other issue is, does the city have the authority to make these changes that have major implications significantly impacting this development when there is a clear LPAT agreement?
- 2) They are asking for ridiculous exemptions that I discuss below. Even with the 90 units that we agreed on in the LPAT minutes of settlement, these will be much larger houses with smaller lots. As it is, there will not be a park, so if a family wants a decent size lot for children, a pool, pets, and other uses, the lots would be very small with a larger house. Of course, this will lead to more water running off from the hard surfaces that need to make its way into a proper storm management pond.
- 3) It was the TRCA that determined that the OS1-H area was not to be developed, as it was supposed to be left as natural heritage land due to it being at "top of bank" (the top of a high slope), a significant part of the Oak Ridges Moraine, and therefore logically should have a storm management pond at the bottom/low point in the southern part of the development. The other major problem with the application is that the city did not include the TRCA comments in the package they sent nor Savanta's natural heritage studies (there are at least 2 studies and possibly more that were not included). Savanta submitted a very substandard and questionable 2019 Environmental Impact Assessment report of the Rizmi lands (11333 Dufferin) at Kirby/Dufferin.
- 4) Storm management tanks have not ever been used in Vaughan residential developments. While a couple of these tanks have been used in industrial developments in York Region, one is being piloted and the one in Richmond Hill was studied by TRCA and found to have deficiencies – it was not working as

designed. Once built, deficiencies are almost impossible to rectify and the developer wants to put the storage tank on the side of a hill, whereas the stormwater management pond is always located at a low point in all subdivisions.

The downsides of storm management tanks are numerous ranging from cost issues to other problems that may be associated with flooding, They are expensive, difficult and costly to fix, can clog, and empty slowly. This would probably result in flooding as water does not drain at as it should and can contribute to West Nile Virus. Another risk of placing them in residential areas such as a valley land like 1600 Teston are high in terms of malfunctions and flooding. Storm management tanks empty very slowly and do get clogged, as well as difficult to clean. Storm management ponds are easily cleaned and maintained.

The storm management tank will be on a hill and not at the lowest part of the subdivision, but at one of the highest points. How will the water get up there? Will we have flooding issues, since the tank is on a hill above parts of the subdivision? What will be the long range costs of such a ridiculous proposal? Who will cover the costs of maintenance?

Even with the 90 units that we agreed on in the LPAT minutes of settlement, these will be much larger houses with smaller lots. As it is, there will not be a park, so if a family wants a decent size lot for children, a pool, pets, and other uses, the lots would be very small with a larger house.

We have been told that documents are missing such as the TRCA, Savanta, and other reports. It was the TRCA that determined the OSI-H designation and for that portion not to be developed.

So far, we do not have public transportation on Dufferin north of Major Mackenzie. The Kirby GO station is not a reality nor do we have public transportation on Kirby. Dufferin north of Eagle's Nest has two lanes as well as Kirby and Teston. The Teston extension is complicated, going through two former landfills (Toronto and Vaughan), wetlands, and other sensitive areas (not to mention the estimated \$100,000,000.00 bridge over the Little Don). The Kirby extension has been a problematic process, so far costing us almost \$1,000,000.00 extra for the financially botched Kirby Road Environmental Assessment. Our schools will eventually be overflowing again, roads will be again jammed with traffic, and water supply (water pressure) / wastewater will surely become an issue due to the York Region's questionable management and almost 3 billion dollar debt, along with potential flooding problems.

Rose Rubino  
[REDACTED] Hunterwood Chase