

**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** RE: [External] ONTARIO LAND TRIBUNAL APPEALS OLT CASE NO. OLT-21-001221

---

**From:** Ron Moro [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 06, 2022 12:20 AM  
**To:** Maurizio Bevilacqua <[Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca](mailto:Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca)>; Mario Ferri <[Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca](mailto:Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca)>; Gino Rosati <[Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca](mailto:Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca)>; Linda Jackson <[Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca](mailto:Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca)>; Tony Carella <[Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca](mailto:Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca)>; Marilyn Iafrate <[Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca](mailto:Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca)>; Rosanna DeFrancesca <[Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca](mailto:Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca)>; Sandra Yeung Racco <[Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca](mailto:Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca)>; Alan Shefman <[Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca](mailto:Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca)>; [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**Cc:** Lucy Cardile <[Lucy.Cardile@vaughan.ca](mailto:Lucy.Cardile@vaughan.ca)>; Julia Tullo <[Julia.Tullo@vaughan.ca](mailto:Julia.Tullo@vaughan.ca)>; Nadia Nascimben <[Nadia.Nascimben@vaughan.ca](mailto:Nadia.Nascimben@vaughan.ca)>; Enza Barbieri <[Enza.Barbieri@vaughan.ca](mailto:Enza.Barbieri@vaughan.ca)>; Rosemary Perricciolo <[Rosemary.Perricciolo@vaughan.ca](mailto:Rosemary.Perricciolo@vaughan.ca)>; Natalie McBoyle <[Natalie.McBoyle@vaughan.ca](mailto:Natalie.McBoyle@vaughan.ca)>; Nancy Tamburini <[Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca](mailto:Nancy.Tamburini@vaughan.ca)>; Gina Ciampa <[Gina.Ciampa@vaughan.ca](mailto:Gina.Ciampa@vaughan.ca)>; Cindy Furfaro <[Cindy.Furfaro@vaughan.ca](mailto:Cindy.Furfaro@vaughan.ca)>; Debi Traub <[Debi.Traub@vaughan.ca](mailto:Debi.Traub@vaughan.ca)>  
**Subject:** [External] ONTARIO LAND TRIBUNAL APPEALS OLT CASE NO. OLT-21-001221

ONTARIO LAND TRIBUNAL APPEALS OLT CASE NO. OLT-21-001221  
919819 ONTARIO LTD. AND 1891445 ONTARIO INC.  
5217 AND 5225 HIGHWAY 7, AND 26 AND 32 HAWMAN AVENUE  
FILES: OP.18.008 AND Z.18.01  
February 8, 2022 Committee of the Whole Closed Meeting

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments regarding this particular item which is very dear to myself and my family who have lived in this neighbourhood for the last 30 years.

We strongly request that Council oppose the proposed amendment to the existing Low-Rise Residential zoning designation to Mid-Rise Residential Zoning.

We request that Vaughan Council instruct staff to retain a lawyer and a planner to defend this opposition at the scheduled Ontario Land Tribunal.

#### **Majority of Local Residents Oppose Proposed Amendment**

On June 22, 2020 a petition undertaken in the midst of a pandemic was presented to Council. The petition was signed by 263 residents representing 72% of mostly longtime residents in our low density landlocked community. Over 91% of the adjacent residents and residents on McKenzie Street and Hawman strongly oppose this proposed amendment to facilitate a 12 storey condo development.

Considering we live in the neighbourhood 24/7 our opinion should be respected much more than those that do not live off Kipling south of HWY 7.

#### **OMB Supported the Low-Rise Residential Zoning**

This proposed amendment is extremely frustrating to our residents. In 2008, our community devoted an enormous amount of volunteer time, effort, and money to retain a lawyer and a planner to protect our stable low density neighbourhood from unfair intensification. At the OMB case #PL080857a number of experienced lawyers and accredited planners representing Vaughan, York Region, Ontario, WWHA (Residents), and the Appellant.

OMB Madame Chair S.J. Sutherland stated in the Memorandum of Oral Decision Delivered on June 25, 2009 and by Order of the Board.  
*"The Board heard unchallenged expert land use planning evidence in support of the application, as amended by the settlement agreement, from Mauro Peverini, on behalf of the City, and Rosemary Humphries, on Behalf of the Applicant/Appellant"*

*"the adjustment of the boundary line for OPA 661, as represented in the settlement, helps protect the character of the well maintained neighbourhood, the proposed development borders, and represents good planning"*

*"the settlement is in the public interest"*

The following settlement highlights greatly influenced the 60% of residents that voted in favour of the settlement that allowed the condo on southwest corner:

- low density residential boundary line to be re-positioned
- Petro Canada property maximum height 6 storeys

- 5225 HWY 7 maximum height 4 storeys
- 5217 HWY 7 no intensification
- McKenzie Street removed from the regional intensification corridor.

The OMB supported settlement was signed by the City of Vaughan, West Woodbridge Homeowners Association and the Appellant. The settlement particulars were subsequently embedded in the Vaughan Official Plan 2010.

Recent discussions with neighbours regarding the settlement has caused a division, and many have become disenfranchised with the planning process.

How fair would it be to the residents if any of these parties, especially our elected representatives, flip-flop today on their support of the Low-Rise Residential zoning?

#### **NO Changes to Kipling & HWY 7 Area to Justify Amendment**

There have been no changes to the south side of HWY 7 east of Kipling to justify an amendment to the existing Low-Rise Residential zoning. As you know,

- HWY 7 has not been widened, on this section of HWY 7
- No rapid transit lanes on this section of HWY 7
- No transit on Kipling
- Kipling & HWY 7 intersection continues to be a small awkwardly configured intersection
- Intersection is on a crest of a hill
- Kipling south is a dead end and does not extend to Steeles

The only change has been increased traffic creating a severe bottleneck at this intersection which hampers emergency vehicles from navigating through.

#### **Vaughan Mid-Rise Residential Guidelines not Adhered**

We ask that you visit the proposed condo site before making a decision. It will be very apparent that squeezing the proposed development (12 storeys, 166 units, 192 parking spots) onto two lots is not harmonious and consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood. This is an important principle in the Vaughan Mid-Rise Residential Guidelines. For that matter it does not abide with the spirit of the Provincial Policy Statement. Acceptable transition or step back planning principals from the 4 adjacent properties have not been fully implemented. Imagine a 12 storey condo only 9 meters from a bungalow. You will not find a similar situation in Vaughan. These longtime residents will never be able to quietly and peacefully enjoy their property. In addition, the proposed building is not at an intersection but mid-block and will interfere with the sightlines of McKenzie Street residents.

#### **Resident Development Suggestion**

We have made our feelings known to the developer at the two meetings with Council's select group of residents over the last year. This is the wrong location for a condo and that it represents poor planning. The developer is opportunistic in that these are the only two lots fronting HWY 7 before the adjoining McKenzie Street. The developer has refused to consider our suggestion that luxury townhomes with above ground driveways and garages are more appropriate for that location. The sole goal of maximizing revenue at the expense of disrupting the lives of existing low density homeowners is not good planning.


#### **Intensification Developments in our Neighbourhood**

Our community is not NIMBY as we have done our part to facilitate intensification. We have a condo at the southwest corner and stacked townhomes just west of it. A proposed condo development further south off Kipling was rejected by the OMB in favour of a stacked townhomes development. In addition, two condos have been approved at HWY 7 and Lansdowne.

We ask that you don't make a mockery of the planning process by flip flopping on the City's support of the OMB decision designating these properties as Low-Rise Residential zoning.

We desperately require advocates to support the best interest of our landlocked community, please oppose and defend!!!

Respectively,

Ron Moro  
 Tasha Court