

---

**From:** Noel Gabriel [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 17, 2022 1:22 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** mackenzieridgerpa@gmail.com  
**Subject:** [External] Opposition to Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.21.046 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision Amendment 19T-17V009.

Dear Mayor Bevilacqua and Vaughan Councillors,

I am writing the communication in opposition to Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.21.046 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision Amendment 19T-17V009. Below are the reasons for the opposition.

**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) **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.

Some studies point out the **benefits of these tanks such as keeping water cool for slow downstream release benefiting some aquatic species**. The **main problem is that 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 the subdivision such as the Laurentian, Maple Downs, and Mackenzie Ridge ponds.

The **downsides of storm management tanks** are numerous ranging from cost issues to other problems that may be associated with flooding and here are **other reasons not to use storm management tanks**:

a) They are **expensive, difficult and costly to fix, can clog, and empty slowly. This would probably result in flooding.**

b) The TRCA reviewed the water storage tank located in Richmond Hill, which sits underneath the commercial plaza parking lot. It found that water does not drain as it should, did not meet the objectives of the design which means that water ponds and can contribute to West Nile Virus

c) The risk of placing them in residential areas such as a valley land like 1600 Teston are high in terms of malfunctions and flooding. With what are seen as 100 or even 200 year storms on the west coast and east coast seem more frequent and have led to extensive and dramatic 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. Storm management tanks may have to be taken apart once they stop draining at an enormous expense to taxpayers.

d) Who is **going to compensate those who experience flood damage as a result of irresponsible decisions**? Will councillors and engineers who support using storm management tanks in residential areas share the costs and responsibility when residence and insurance companies sue them?

e) 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 there be pumping**

**stations? How about drainage? 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 maintainence? The storm management was placed where the old house will be torn down because it is one of the lowest parts of the development (in OS1-H) in order to easily draining the Little Don River (next to the proposed storm management pond).**

Thanks,

Christopher Noel Gabriel  
■ Germana Place

Sent from my iPhone