#### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015**

Item 4, Report No. 32, of the Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on September 16, 2015, as follows:

By receiving Communication C1 from Ms. Sandy Salerno, dated September 9, 2015.

4

#### OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILE OP.15.004 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.15.012 REX-CON CONSTRUXION CORP. AND 1257665 ONTARIO INC. WARD 4 - VICINITY OF KEELE STREET AND ROCKVIEW GARDENS

The Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) recommends:

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Commissioner of Planning, Director of Development Planning, and Manager of Development Planning, dated September 9, 2015, be approved;
- 2) That the following deputations and communications be received:
  - 1. Mr. Michael Manett, MPlan Inc., Foxwood Road, Thornhill, on behalf of the applicant;
  - 2. Mr. Robert Maggiacomo, Rockview Gardens, Concord;
  - 3. Ms. Cathy Ferlisi, Southview Drive, Concord, C19, dated August 24, 2015, and Communication C50, presentation material titled "Support Concord West R1V Old Village Designation" dated September 9, 2015;
  - 4. Ms. Linda Giancola, Rockview Gardens, Concord, and Communication C26, dated August 24, 2015;
  - 5. Ms. Jeanne Morson, Southview Drive, Concord;
  - 6. Ms. Rosetta DePricso, Southview Drive, Concord;
  - 7. Mr. Dominico Paolo, Hillside Avenue, Vaughan;
  - 8. Ms. Silvana Galloro, Southview Drive, Concord;
  - 9. Mr. Enzo Morson, Southview Drive, Concord;
  - 10. Mr. Bruno Trasolini, Denbigh Crescent, Toronto; and
  - 11. Ms. Teresa Panezutti, Rockview Gardens, Concord, and Communication C39, dated August 20, 2015; and
- 3) That the following communications be received:
  - C1 Rosa and Gabriele Damico, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C2 Ms. Silvana Bianchi, Rockview Gardens, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C3 Ms. Giuseppina Virgioni, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C4 Ms. Connie Miceli, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C5 Benvenuto and Rosina Trozzo, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C6 Fredrick, Doinic, Bruno, Aurelio, Liliana Nuosci and Caterina Sorbara, Baldwin Avenue, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C7 Cesare and Angela Bruno, Rockview Gardens, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C8 Natalina and Fernando Miranda, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C9 Tony and Faye Bruni, dated August 24, 2015;
  - C10 Gabriele and Anna DiNorscia, Keeleview Court, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C11 Maria and Luigi Minici, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C12 Mr. Antonio Franco, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C13 Anita and Paul DeRose, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C14 Gina Doldolea and Daoud Klana, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C15 Rino and Delfina Mascarin, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;
  - C16 Mr. Constantino DiMarco, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 23, 2015;

#### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

### Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 2

- C17 Rose, Gabriel, Anthony, Victoria DiMarco, Baldwin Avenue and Anna Alonzo, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C18 George and Julie Seemann, Rockview Gardens, Concord, dated August 25, 2015;
- C20 Benedetto, Giuseppina, Robert and Mauro Antonini, Baldwin Avenue, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C21 Mr. Silvio Rotolone, Keeleview Court, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C22 Ms. Nicola DiPaolo, Keeleview Court, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C23 Mr. Antonio Liberata, Keeleview Court, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C24 Matthias and Elizabeth Untderlander, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C25 Giuseppe and Eva Viele, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C27 Cesil and Valda Nichols, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C28 Sabino, Agnes and Onorio Catenacci, Highway 7, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C29 Mr. Adino Venir, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 24, 2015;
- C30 Dirce Mascherin, Rockview Gardens, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C31 Anna and Angelo Primomo, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C32 Pasqua and Giuseppe Romolo, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C33 Antonio and Giuseppina Baldasini, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C34 Natalie, Gabriel, Giovanna, Gino and Maria D'Orazio, Hillside Avenue, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C35 Ernesto and Anna Romano, Rockview Gardens, Concord, dated August 26, 2015;
- C36 Danny and Anna Caporrella, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 27, 2015;
- C37 C. Martino, Southview Drive, Concord, dated August 27, 2015;
- C38 Mr. and Mrs. G. Chiarlitti, dated August 31, 2015;
- C42 Petition, dated September 3, 2015;
- C43 The Baldassini Family and the Marchione Family, Southview Drive, Concord, dated September 4, 2015;
- C44 Mr. Alfredo G. Mastrodicasa, dated September 7, 2015;
- C45 Ms. Josephine Mastrodicasa, President, Concord West Rate Payers Association, dated September 7, 2015;
- C46 Ms. Rosalinda Tiberini, Hillside Avenue, Concord, dated September 5, 2015; and
- C48 Petition, dated July 7, 2015, submitted by Josephine Mastrodicasa, President of Concord West Seniors Club and Concord West Ratepayers Association (on behalf of Concord West residents).

### **Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Planning, Director of Development Planning, and Manager of Development Planning recommend:

1. THAT the Public Hearing report for Files OP.15.004 and Z.15.012 (Rex-con Construxion Corp. and 1257665 Ontario Inc.), BE RECEIVED; and, that any issues identified be addressed by the Vaughan Planning Department in a comprehensive report to the Committee of the Whole.

#### **Contribution to Sustainability**

The contribution to sustainability such as site and building design will be determined when the technical report is considered.

#### Economic Impact

This will be addressed when the technical report is completed.

#### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

### Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 3

#### **Communications Plan**

- a) Date the Notice of Public Hearing was circulated: August 14, 2015
- b) Circulation Area: 150 m plus expanded polling area, as shown on Attachment #2, and to the Concord West Ratepayers Association
- c) Comments Received as of August 25, 2015:
  - i) Humphries Planning Group Inc., Chrislea Road, correspondence dated July 28, 2015, requesting notification of the Vaughan Committee of the Whole and Council meetings for these applications;
  - ii) Concord West Seniors Club, Keele Street, correspondence dated July 7, 2015, regarding a petition of objection citing perceived concerns that the subject lands are inappropriate for intensification and concern about preserving the historical character of the established Concord West neighbourhood;
  - iii) Seniors of Concord West, correspondence dated July 29, 2015, regarding a petition of objection and perceived concerns about increased traffic, the preservation of mature trees, approved intensification areas impact their community and additional intensification within the community is not appropriate, and compatibility with the surrounding community;
  - iv) C. Miceli, Southview Drive, correspondence dated July 6, 2015 and August 23, 2015, regarding an objection to the development proposal regarding the change to the lot orientation and the precedent that may be created to support additional lot severance applications in the Concord West neighbourhood. C. Miceli would also like to see additional parks in the community, and a road connection from Southview Drive to Regional Road 7;
  - v) B. & M. Trasolini, Hillside Avenue, correspondence dated August 11, 2015, regarding an objection to the development proposal and the concern about the change to the character of the community, and negative financial impact on their property;
  - vi) C. Ferlisi, J. Ferlisi, F. Ferlisi, M. Ferlisi, J. Ferlisi, Southview Drive, correspondence dated July 2, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposed reduction in lot size and the perceived negative impact to the community;
  - vii) M. Bonfini, M. Bonfini, R. Bonfini, and T. Bonfini, correspondence dated August 16, 2015, respecting an objection to smaller lot sizes in order to protect the character of the R1V Old Village Residential community;
  - viii) R. Maggiacomo, G. Maggiacomo, A. Filbrandt, I. Pellecchia, M. Pellecchia, Rockview Gardens, correspondence dated August 15, 2015, respecting their objection to the development proposal and their concerns to protect the original village community, the precedent the development proposal would set to enable additional severances, perceived increased traffic, impacts to snow removal and garbage collection, strain on the existing sewer and water services, and that the development proposal does not comply with VOP 2010 policy;
  - R. Damico, G. Damico, Southview Drive, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the smaller lot sizes, and preference to maintain the existing large lots;

#### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

#### Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 4

- S. Bianchi, Keele Street, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the smaller lot size, and preference to maintain the existing larger lots that create a secluded and peaceful neighbourhood;
- xi) G. Virgioni, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the smaller lot size, and would like the existing large lots to remain;
- xii) C. Bruno, A. Bruno, Rockview Gardens, correspondence dated August 23, respecting an objection to the smaller lot size; purchased in this community for the large lots;
- xiii) N. Miranda, F. Miranda, Southview Drive, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the smaller lot size, and concerned about the precedent that the development proposal would set to enable additional severances;
- xiv) G. DiNorscia, A. DiNorscia, Keeleview Court, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal and the perceived negative impact to property values;
- xv) C. DiMarco, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal; would like to see the existing large lots in the area remain;
- R. Mascarin, D. Mascarin, Southview Drive, correspondence dated August 23, 2015 respecting an objection to the proposal due to the perceived negative impact to property values;
- xvii) G. Doldolea, D. Klana, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal due to the perceived negative impact to property values and the precedent that may be set to enable additional severances;
- A. DeRose, P. DeRose, Southview Drive, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal due to the perceived increase in traffic;
- xix) A. Franco, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal; would like the existing large lots in the community to be maintained;
- M. Minici, L. Minici, M. Minici, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal; would like the two large lots to be maintained so that their home does not face other homes;
- xxi) F. Nuosci, D. Nuosci, B. Nuoci, A. Nuosci, L. Nuosci, C. Sorbara, Baldwin Avenue, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal; purchased their home because it did not face other homes; they feel this proposal would negatively impact their family;
- xxii) B. Trozzo, R. Trozzo, Southview Drive, correspondence dated August 23, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal; would like the large lots to be maintained; and,

#### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

#### Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 5

xxiii) T. Bruni, F. Bruni, Southview Drive, correspondence date August 24, 2015, respecting an objection to the proposal, due to perceived traffic congestion, street parking problems, and reduced property values.

Any additional written comments received will be forwarded to the Office of the City Clerk to be distributed to the Committee of the Whole as a Communication. All written comments that are received will be reviewed by the Vaughan Planning Department as input in the application review process and will be addressed in the final technical report at a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

#### **Purpose**

To receive comments from the public and the Committee of the Whole on the following applications for the subject lands, shown on Attachments #1 and #2, to facilitate future severances of two existing lots, together having 98.41 m of frontage on Baldwin Avenue to create 6 residential lots for single-detached dwellings consisting of lot frontages ranging from 15.24 m to 18.29 m and lot areas ranging from 507.1 m<sup>2</sup> to 602.5 m<sup>2</sup> along Baldwin Avenue, as shown on Attachment #3:

- 1. Official Plan Amendment File OP.15.004 to amend the policies of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) respecting the design and compatibility criteria for new development within lands designated "Low Rise Residential" and identified as "Community Area", including lot configuration and size, built form, and physical character of the surrounding developments.
- Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.15.012 to rezone the subject lands from R1V Old Village Residential Zone (minimum 30 m frontages) to R2 Residential Zone (minimum 15 m frontages).

Location	<ul> <li>The subject lands are located on the southwest corner of Rockview Gardens and Baldwin Avenue, and on the northwest corner of Southview Drive and Baldwin Avenue, municipally know as 23 Rockview Gardens and 10 Southview Drive, respectively, as shown on Attachments #1 and #2.</li> </ul>
Official Plan Designation	<ul> <li>The subject lands are designated "Low-Rise Residential" by Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010), and are located within a "Community Area" as identified on Schedule "1" - Urban Structure of VOP 2010. The designation permits single detached dwellings and there is no associated density requirement.</li> </ul>
	• VOP 2010 identifies compatibility criteria for new developments in a "Community Area". The compatibility criteria directs that new development is designed to respect and reinforce the physical character of the established neighbourhood within which it is located. In addition, proposed new development in an established "Community Area" shall pay particular attention to, but not limited to, local lot patterns, size and configuration, and existing building types with similar setbacks.

### Background - Analysis and Options

# EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 6

	-	"Community Areas" are generally established within older, residential neighbourhoods that are characterized by large lots and/or historical, architectural, or landscape value. They are also characterized by their substantial rear, front and side yards, and lot coverages that contribute to expansive amenity areas, which provide opportunities for attractive landscaped properties and streetscapes.
	-	As the proposed infill development is located on and within a predominantly existing established large lot residential subdivision, the proposal does not address the compatibility criteria for new development within existing "Community Areas", and therefore, an amendment to VOP 2010 is required.
		Attachment #2 to this report shows smaller lot sizes in the vicinity, including directly to the east and south on lots zoned R3 Residential Zone (single detached on minimum 12 m frontages) and R5 Residential Zone (single and semi-detached on minimum 7.5 m/unit frontages), where the applicant will need to demonstrate through the Official Plan Amendment application the compatibility of the proposal with the existing neighbourhood fabric
Zoning	•	The subject lands are zoned R1V Old Village Residential Zone by Zoning By-law 1-88, which permits only single detached dwellings on lots with minimum lot frontage of 30 m and lot area of 845 $m^2$ .
	-	The Owners are proposing to rezone two existing single detached residential lots from R1V Old Village Residential Zone to R2 Residential Zone. The R2 Residential Zone in Zoning By-law 1-88 requires a minimum lot frontage of 15 m and a minimum lot area of 450 m <sup>2</sup> per unit.
		The 6 proposed lots as shown on Attachment #3 exceed the minimum requirements of the R2 Residential Zone of Zoning By-law 1-88 as follows:
		<ul> <li>i. minimum lot frontages ranging from 15.24 m to 18.29 m; and,</li> <li>ii. minimum lot areas ranging from 507.1 m<sup>2</sup> to 602.5 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>
	•	The Owners have not requested any amendments to the minimum development standards (e.g. building setbacks, height, etc.) of the R2 Residential Zone, and are proposing to comply in all respects.
	-	The Owners have submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment application to implement the proposed R2 Residential Zone and to facilitate the future creation of 6 lots for single-detached dwellings.

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 7

#2.	Shown on Attachment #2.
-----	-------------------------

# **Preliminary Review**

Following a preliminary review of the applications, the Vaughan Planning Department has identified the following matters to be reviewed in greater detail:

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
a.	Conformity with Provincial policies, Regional and City Official Plans	<ul> <li>The applications will be reviewed in consideration of the applicable Provincial policies and the Regional and City Official Plan policies, particularly the policies in VOP 2010 respecting the design and compatibility criteria for new development in a "Community Area".</li> </ul>
b.	Appropriateness of Proposed Rezoning and Uses	<ul> <li>The appropriateness of the proposed rezoning of the subject lands to facilitate the future creation of 6 lots for single detached dwellings, as shown on Attachment #3, will be reviewed in consideration of the existing and planned surrounding land uses, with particular consideration given to land use, lot size and configuration, transition, minimum development standards, built form compatibility, and traffic impact.</li> </ul>
c.	Functional Servicing Report	<ul> <li>The Owners have submitted the following reports in support of the development proposal, which must be reviewed and approved to the satisfaction of the York Region Transportation and Community Planning Development and the Vaughan Development Engineering and Infrastructure Planning Services Department:</li> <li>Functional Servicing Report, 23 Rockview Gardens</li> <li>Functional Servicing Report, 10 Southview Drive</li> </ul>
d.	Arborist Report and Tree Inventory	<ul> <li>The Arborist Report and Tree Inventory, prepared by Graves Oak Tree Care Inc., in support of the development proposal must be reviewed, to the satisfaction of the Vaughan Planning Department.</li> <li>The health of the trees and trees to be removed and preserved, and any addition of trees, will be reviewed and identified in the future technical report.</li> </ul>
e.	Planning Justification Report	<ul> <li>The Planning Justification Report, prepared by MPlan Inc., in support of the development proposal must be reviewed, to the satisfaction of the Vaughan Development Planning Department.</li> </ul>

#### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

## Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 8

f.	Urban Design and Sustainability Brief	<ul> <li>The Urban Design and Sustainability Brief, prepared by MPlan Inc., in support of the development proposal must be reviewed, to the satisfaction of the Vaughan Development Planning Department.</li> </ul>
g.	Parkland Dedication	<ul> <li>Should the subject development applications be approved through the Consent (Severance) Application process, the requirement for Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland Dedication to the City of Vaughan in accordance with the Planning Act and the City's Cash-in-Lieu Policy will be determined.</li> </ul>
h.	Future Consent Application	<ul> <li>Should the subject development applications be approved, the Owners will be required to submit Consent Applications to the City of Vaughan for severance to create 6 lots for single- detached dwellings. The Owner must successfully obtain approval of the Consent Applications from the Vaughan Committee of Adjustment and satisfy any conditions of the Committee.</li> </ul>
i.	Servicing	<ul> <li>Servicing allocation for water and sanitary must be identified and allocated by Vaughan Council to the development, if the subject applications are approved. Should servicing capacity be unavailable, the lands will be zoned with the Holding Symbol "(H)", which will be removed once servicing capacity is identified and allocated to the subject lands by Vaughan Council.</li> </ul>

#### Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

The applicability of the applications to the Vaughan Vision will be determined when the technical report is considered.

#### Regional Implications

The development proposal has been circulated to the York Region Transportation and Community Planning Department for review and comment. Any issues will be identified and addressed when the technical report is considered. The Owners have requested York Region to exempt Official Plan Amendment File OP.15.004 from Regional approval, as the applications can be considered to be a matter of local rather than regional significance. On July 16, 2015, the York Region Development Review Committee considered this application and granted exemption from approval by Regional Council. Should Vaughan Council approve Official Plan Amendment File OP.15.004, the Regional exemption would enable the Official Plan Amendment to come into effect following its adoption by Vaughan Council and the expiration of the required appeal period.

#### **Conclusion**

The preliminary issues identified in this report and any other issues identified through the processing of the applications will be considered in the technical review of the applications, together with comments from the public and Vaughan Council expressed at the Public Hearing or in writing, and will be addressed in a comprehensive report to a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

## Item 4, CW(PH) Report No. 32 - Page 9

#### **Attachments**

- 1. Context Location Map
- 2. Location Map & Expanded Polling Area
- 3. Conceptual Site Plan

#### Report prepared by:

Carol Birch, Planner, ext. 8485 Stephen Lue, Senior Planner, ext. 8210

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)