

Magnifico, Rose

Subject: FW: March 22, 2015 City Council Meeting // Item #4: // 177, 186 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue
Attachments: Synopsis of FCF Old Market Lane (2013) Inc .doc

c 14
Communication
COUNCIL: Mar 22 / 16
SPCW Rpt. No. 13 Item 1

From: Maria Verna [mailto:mariaverna@rogers.com]

Sent: March-20-16 11:59 PM

To: Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Di Biase, Michael; Rosati, Gino; Ferri, Mario; Carella, Tony; Iafrate, Marilyn; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Racco, Sandra; Shefman, Alan; Abrams, Jeffrey; Kanellakos, Steve; Magnifico, Rose

Cc: Tricia. Santaguida.; Gina Pietrangelo; g p; Ed Uchimaru; Pina Sacco; Pina Sacco; Lou DeBellis; Americo Viola; Jamie Maynard; Elisa Tortola; njaved@thestar.ca; amartinrobbins@yrmg.com; Richard Lorello; info@villageofwoodbridge.ca

Subject: March 22, 2015 City Council Meeting // Item #4: // 177, 186 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue

Good Morning Honourable Mayor, Member of Council and City Staff

Mr. Abrams, please post this communication along with the attachment in advance of the March 22 1:00 City Council Meeting

Please allow us to bring to your attention a number of concerns we have regarding a current application on Woodbridge Avenue. To preface these concerns, we reference a statement made by you to Adam Martin-Robbins of the Vaughan Citizen following the October 2014 elections. You stated *"I think you have to continue in the same governance style and that is consensus-building and leading in a way that is consistent with the values, principles and beliefs of the citizens of Vaughan."* – [source: Vaughan Citizen, Oct 30, 2014; article: *One Key Change at Vaughan City Hall after Monday's Vote*]

In that spirit, we respectfully request your support on behalf of the *Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association (VWRPA)* and your Woodbridge constituents, to help us stop the application put forth by FCF Old Market Lane 2013, Inc., with respect to 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue. As existing residents and taxpayers, we have become increasingly frustrated and discouraged by the progression of events related to this application and now feel we must reach out to you for assistance.

What follows is a brief synopsis of events and corresponding issues, and does not constitute an exhaustive list of concerns.

Process

Meetings were arranged by Councilor Carella between the Applicant and the Community and these were attended by the Community in good faith. The Community was led to believe that the meetings would be collaborative in nature. Unfortunately, even though five meetings were held, the Applicant did not factor in Community suggestions and continued to present the same renderings. By all indications, these meetings were a "check box" for the Applicant but in actuality engendered much frustration and distrust amongst the Community as their good faith and collaborative approach to the process was not reciprocated by the Applicant.

The Cultural Heritage Coordinator, submitted a report to the Heritage Vaughan Committee identifying five (5) significant violations in this application that fail to conform to the prescribed Woodbridge HCD Plan. When the application was presented to Heritage Vaughan Committee, the committee agreed unanimously that the site Application is not a contextual fit within the Woodbridge Conservation Area. Members of Heritage Vaughan stated the buildings were "institutional" and "unsympathetic" to the area. The recommendation from Heritage Vaughan was for the Applicant go back to the Community and work with them to develop a more appropriate and suitable design for the subject property. This did not happen.

With regard to Section 37, decisions were made without the knowledge of or with consultation with the Community. Despite the level of activity from the Community on this application, the Community was never engaged or even notified of potential resulting "community benefits". From our understanding, Section 37 arrangements cannot be made in an HCD without first being forwarded to Council.

The re-designation of this VOP for this specific site was not discussed in public forum. The new VOP 2010 has this application lot designated for "low-rise mixed-use 4 storey with an FSI of 1.0". On Jan 19th, 2016, Vaughan City Staff and Council voted on a closed-door deal with the applicant to re-zone the subject property to a "mid-rise mixed-use with an FSI of 3.0". As this deal was not disclosed to the area residents prior to completion, the process is, again, marred by a lack of transparency. According to published

sources, to date, Vaughan has spent \$18 million trying to implement an official plan that had already undergone community and stakeholder negotiations. This application is contributing to this rising expense. As taxpayers, we do not want to see more money wasted on senseless deviations to the Official Plan.

Heritage Conservation

This Community is designated by the City of Vaughan as a Heritage District under the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan. The site proposal contains the last two untouched historical homes on Woodbridge Avenue. Aside from retaining the partial outer shell of these homes, the application completely fails to recognize the historical and cultural significance of these homes and their surrounding topography. They are absolutely essential to the retention of Woodbridge Avenue's historical streetscape.

As a precedent, on Jan 8th 2010, the City of Vaughan and Josie Greco-Alviani and Fabio Alviani entered a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement in regards to 10384 Islington Avenue (Property - Martin Smith House) which acknowledged the contextual value of not only the heritage home but also the topography (the "knoll"). This agreement was a result of an OMB ruling (File #PL08179). Similarly, the rolling topography and more prominent "knoll" on which the McLean House is situated on Woodbridge Avenue would be protected by the Woodbridge HCD rules.

In closing, we cite additional comments made at the 2012 Vaughan Heritage Preservations Awards, where citizens, like us, took initiative to protect the heritage of Vaughan:

"This year's recipients undertook the important and culturally significant task of preserving our historical buildings and our heritage," said Mayor Maurizio Bevilacqua. "On behalf of the City of Vaughan, I would like to thank the special individuals whose efforts have helped promote and conserve Vaughan's cultural heritage resources. Their commitment serves as windows to our past as we continue to grow and move our City forward." 2012 Vaughan Heritage Preservation Awards; Thu Feb 23, 2012.

The City of Vaughan is over 27,000 hectares in area. By comparison, the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District is about 10 hectares in size. This represents less than 1/2,700th the area of Vaughan. Why are we intent on so grossly overdeveloping this small, historically significant area when there remain vast areas in Woodbridge and Vaughan that would be more suitable for this development project?

We understand and are sympathetic to the need to intensify and foster growth in the Region however a solid future should not be built on a fragile and eroding past. Do not sacrifice the historical and cultural heritage of this village in order to meet demands of intensification.

Sincerely,

Maria Verna

Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Association

Village of Woodbridge Ratepayers Synopsis of the Site Application for 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue, FCF Old Market Lane (2013) Inc.

Official Plan Amendment File Z.06.009
Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.06.023

1504546 Ontario Limited

OMB File PL111184, Appellant 140 FCF Market Lane (2013)

Vaughan Citizen – Mar 11/16	Woodbridge Condo Project – with potential ramification for historical properties – deferred http://www.yorkregion.com/news-story/6387151-woodbridge-condo-project-with-potential-ramifications-for-historical-properties-deferred/
Toronto Star – Sun Mar 6/16	Father and Son on a quest to save Old Woodbridge http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2016/03/06/father-and-son-on-quest-to-save-old-woodbridge.html
Mar 1/16 – Special Committee of the Whole	<p>On March 1st, 2016, despite inclement weather, over 75 residents from Ward 2 came to the Council Chambers to demonstrate their opposition to the site application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputations were submitted to express the residents' frustration with a process that lacked communication, collaboration, good faith, clear rules and transparency. • Councilors were clearly shocked and surprised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Residents opposed the tentative settlement reached by City Staff and the Applicant. • the Residents were not invited to participate in the settlement process • Heritage Vaughan did not approve or render opinion on the application • Heritage Vaughan did not receive a revised application to review • Several Councilors, including Marilyn Iafate, Alan Shefman and Sandra Racco described the site application as "inappropriate", "ugly", "lego blocks". One commented that if this was a "revised proposal, I am afraid to ask what the original rendering looked like". • Councillor Carella motioned to have the voting of the application postponed until May in order to give the Applicant and Residents more time to arrive at a suitable compromise. If a compromise is not achieved at that time, then the application would be denied. • Regional Councillor DiBiase asked legal staff if Council could rescind their endorsement to settle the offer on the VOP 2010. Legal staff advised to bring the matter in-camera. <p>No decision regarding the site application was reached, and Council deferred the matter to Council Meeting in order to obtain legal counsel.</p> <p>VWRPA Response to Staff Commentary</p> <p>In response to the Staff Report to the Special Committee of the Whole – March 1, 2016-03-20.</p> <p>Concerns of the Residents that were expressed in deputations highlighting issues related to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs related to deviation of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (\$18M and rising) • Traffic • Noise • Removal of mature trees and scarring of natural topography • Height • Density • Incompatibility of proposed design • Contextual problem impacting surrounding town homes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation and partial demolition of existing heritage homes • Erosion of historical and "village" feel of the Woodbridge Core • Complete disrespects of the Residents' recommendation regarding height, density, context and design. <p>Throughout this process, the residents have consistently expressed that they are not opposed to development in the Woodbridge Core, but development must be in keeping with the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 which is already a compromise and dictates the allowable intensification in the Woodbridge Core. Residents do not want to see more money spent on deviations from the Vaughan Official Plan</p>
<p>Jan 19/16 – City Council vote to accept developers offer to settle on their appeal of the VOP 2010</p>	<p>On January 26th the VWRPA received an invitation to participate in a conference call with the City Lawyer, Ms. Dawne Jubb in order to provide details of the settlement offer that would to be endorsed by City Council with regards to the designation of the sites at 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue. The VWRPA was advised of the following:</p> <p><i>"on March 23rd the Developer will be bringing in a motion seeking approval to amend the VOP for the designation of this particular land on this particular site:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To go from low rise mixed-use to go to mid rise mixed-use, to allow for additional height on property of 7-storeys; of that 7-storeys that will contain 119 units and commercial space; and FSI seeking 3"</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was the first time the residents were notified that a settlement was sought and an agreement had been reached. The residents questioned why zoning issues were being discussed behind closed doors without public engagement or involvement. The residents also questioned who represented the community and expressed concern that the settlement had no indicated evidence that issues brought forth by the residents were addressed. • The Residents of the Woodbridge Core Area have been committed to an open, collaborative process since the onset of this application yet there was no transparency, no collaboration and no compromise with the reached settlement. Residents feel that the Applicant and the City have not been dealing with them in good faith.
<p>Dec 17/15 – Meeting with Manager of Urban Design Mr. Bayley and Senior Planner Mrs. Caputo and Residents</p>	<p>Three area residents met with Mr. Bayley and Ms. Caputo to ensure that City Staff were fully aware of the concerns of the residents and their commitment to protecting the continuity of the community's character. At this time, no staff reports had been finalized therefore technical data was not shared. A meeting took place that discussed the area and the residents' concerns with overdevelopment and the most recent building completed on Woodbridge Avenue.</p> <p>In this regard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 160 Woodbridge Ave (The Grand Manor) – the design and colour choices are entirely inconsistent with the neighbourhood, bordering on offensive (the building is peach and green) – Situated on this lot is the historical Inkerman Hotel. The extreme miscommunication between the developer and the City is nowhere more apparent than this property. What was once a beautiful historical home is now a tasteless reminder of the lack of due diligence in ensuring continuity. The site is already falling into disrepair. – Mr. Bayley's commentary on this application – A MISTAKE • 83 Woodbridge Ave (Terraces on the Park) – as the façade of this development begins at the sidewalk, this building's overall height and lack of set back imposes a claustrophobic and ominous presence over the intersection of Woodbridge Ave. and Clarence St. <p>This development was built right on the flood plain before guidelines for the Special Policy Area guidelines were finalized. In order to facilitate the need for parking and the threat of water, the 2-storey garage was built above ground,</p> <p>Mr. Bayley's commentary on this application – A MISTAKE</p>

	<p>When Mr. Bayley was asked the question "why would we make a third mistake?" he dismissed the question by clearly stating that this application was going to be approved at the current height as requested by the application. He also stated that there was a \$1M settlement for community benefit (Woodbridge Streetscape Plan) that was in current negotiation with the Applicant.</p>	
<p>Oct 21/15 - Heritage Vaughan Committee Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents from the Village of Woodbridge area were in attendance at the Heritage Vaughan Committee meeting and will attest to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When asked the residents of the community expressed unanimous frustration with the application citing concerns about density, height, impact and preservation of the heritage home, impact to the streetscape and topography of the area, Notified Committee Members that they did engage in meetings with the applicant. The applicant presented the project. This was in no way, shape or form a collaborative process. While the applicant listened to community feedback, this feedback was not incorporated into the renderings. The meetings were very much one sided. Committee Members did receive the report from the Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, however they did not support the application. Taken directly from the minutes to Heritage Vaughan Committee Meeting: <p>"That the Heritage Vaughan Committee requested that the applicant reconsider the present proposal taking into consideration the issues raised regarding a design for the new development that is sympathetic to the historic character of the district and the two heritage buildings, and work with the community to find an acceptable approach for this development."</p> On Dec 9/15 a 5th Community Meeting was held with the Applicant in response to Heritage Vaughan's request to "<i>work with the community to find an acceptable approach for this development</i>". The Applicant presented the same building with the same characteristics that was presented to the Village of Woodbridge residents in the previous meetings. Other than a few minor cosmetic changes to the POPS, the applicant did not change any design aspects of the building, particularly with regard to height, density and appearance. The residents remained frustrated by the applicant's unwillingness to respect the request from Heritage Vaughan and failure to collaborate with the community. The Community Meeting continued after the applicant had departed. Councillor Carella and R.Bayley, Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage heard the continued frustration and escalating concerns of the area residents. <p>This application did not follow the Heritage Vaughan approval process. After the meeting on Oct 21/15, this application did not go back to Heritage Vaughan for approval/support.</p>	
<p>Staff recommendation to the Heritage Vaughan Committee</p>	<p>Commentary from Heritage Vaughan Staff submitted for the Oct 21/15 Heritage Vaughan Committee meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vaughan Heritage's planning argument for recommendation of the site application – Contribution to Sustainability as per: Goal 4: To create a vibrant community where citizens, business and visitors thrive. <i>Objective 4.1: "To foster a city with strong social cohesion, an engaging arts</i> 	<p>VWRPA Response to Staff Commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community contends that an "institutional" glass and brick, 7 storey building that is 3 times the allowable density as per VOP 2010 does not meet with Objective 4.1, even remotely. The site proposal contravenes Woodbridge HCD Plan.

	<p><i>scene, and a clear sense of its culture and heritage".</i></p> <p>Analysis Arguments as presented by Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Woodbridge Center Secondary Plan and the Woodbridge HCD Plan both speak to the existing heritage character of Woodbridge Ave as a commercial corridor and a focal point to the village which shall be conserved carried into future developmentBuilding Height – The proposed height does not conform to the guideline, however, the overage in height will have minimal impact to the heritage assets on the site as it is stepped back and the overage in height is limited to a small portion of the siteSetbacks – The proposed relocation of the heritage homes is inconsistent with the HCD guidelines, however, in this instance, relocation of the heritage buildings will provide the following substantial realm benefits, improved pedestrian experience and POPS and commercial reuse of heritage homesTransition of new Building in Relations to Heritage Resources-the proposed development does not meet the 45-degree angular plane guideline for transitions to new buildings although large side yard setbacks have been provided to both heritage resourcesNew Construction- Woodbridge HDC plan, sections 6.3.2, 6.3.3: state that construction "should be of 'it time,'" and should "fit this village context while at the same time representing current design philosophy"...for new buildings in this heritage district the design should take into account the proportion of the buildings in the immediate context and consider a design with proportional relationships that will make it a good fit"
<p>This proposal does not meet the objectives of the Woodbridge HCD Plan.</p>	<p>6.1.1 Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Generally, new buildings along Woodbridge Ave. should be no taller than 4 floors (13m) and must be sympathetic to, and transition from, the height of adjacent contributing buildings with a minimum 45-degree angular plan, starting from the existing height of the contributing building's edgeExisting contributing buildings should retain their historic setbacks, and create front landscaped courtyards that open onto Woodbridge Ave. to build on the 'green' character of the street. <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is home to the last two remaining authentic and historically significant homes in their original topographical setting. They are now all that is left to embody the essence of historical Woodbridge. This site application does nothing to preserve this heritage and history, let alone recognize it. By repurposing these historical homes as residential or commercial (i.e. restaurant), the application does nothing to foster an engaging arts scene or clear sense of culture and heritage in this area.The height the building is overpowering and overwhelms the two historical homes. The overage in height overwhelms the surrounding two storey townhouses to the north, west and south, and the four storey condo to the east of this site. The overall height of structure is exacerbated by the significant grade change on this lot.Other than the POPS (lack of value as discussed, below), the applicant has not submitted evidence that the pedestrian experience will be "improved" (sidewalks must be replaced after the building is completed, <i>regardless</i>). Based on the second rendering, the application does NOT indicate commercial reuse of heritage homes, so this statement is false (private dwelling and amenity room for condo).In this proposal, no angular plane exists. This application sits on 0.35 hectares (0.86 acres); there are no "large" yards of any description in this plan, particularly in reference to the heritage "resources".

	<p>specifically:</p> <p>5.1 Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve contributing buildings, landscape and streetscapes; • Ensure new designs contribute to the Woodbridge Heritage character • Manage any development....proposed within the district, in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to all aspects necessary to ensure the protection and conservation of the heritage resources, in order to maintain the village character of the Woodbridge District • Ensure individual heritage structures and landscapes are maintained and new developments.... sensitively integrated as part of a comprehensive district <p>5.3 Heritage Character Statement</p> <p>The village character and quality of the district should continue to be defined by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a variety of building setbacks, typically having deep frontages and side yards; -->the proposed site plan moves existing heritage homes and new buildings to street level thereby ignoring the contextual value of the homes as they sit on the hill along Woodbridge Ave • a “green” quality where the built form is generally integrated within the natural landscape and topography, with mature trees and tree canopies, creating a park-like development setting and context; -->the proposed site plan does not integrate the new condo nor existing heritage homes within natural topography—it does the opposite by flattening the existing topography (rolling hill) and removing mature trees on site in order to make way for a massive modern looking condo • -->changing the topography of the area the area will have less ‘green’ area significant views that capture the vast river corridor, the rolling topography, and the interplay of the natural landscape and the built form; ***proposed site plan changes the natural topography of the area by removing the rolling hill which is an integral and natural part of the village character and quality of this heritage district. <p>5.3.1.4. Topography</p>
--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rolling topography results in frequent views to the valley, and towards the surrounding hills, especially to key areas such as the Woodbridge commercial core and the Humber River Valley flood plain, and to Kipling Avenue, which is on the ridge. -->the proposal will eliminate the topography of the area, which is one of the categories which is used to describe the physical attributes of the area. By removing the hill, the developer will be removing an attribute of natural, historical and contextual value
		<p>6.2.3 Relocation of Contributing Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings and structures located within properties that are listed as contributing to the Woodbridge HCD Heritage Character should not be relocated and should remain in-situ within their existing context
		<p>6.4.2.2 Street Wall Height and Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional building height, to a maximum of 6 floors (20m), may be considered only when there is no undue impact to the public realm and/or adjacent properties, including an impact on sunlight penetration and views. Additional building height must step back along a 45-degree angular plane from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street, starting at 13 meters, when facing a street and starting at 9.5 meters when facing another property; • The height of many contributing building
		<p>6.5.3 Transitions New Buildings in Relations to Heritage Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The height of the contributing buildings should be maintained. • The setback requirement to adjacent contributing heritage buildings must be at least half the building height. This transition pertains to the back and side yards of the contributing building. • New buildings must transition from the height of adjacent contributing buildings with a minimum of 45-degree angular plane, starting from the existing height of the contributing building. The height of contributing building is measured from the average elevation of the finished grade at the front of the building to the highest point of the roof surface from a flat roof surface for a flat roof and mansard roof; and to the mean height between the eaves and the highest point of a gable, hip, or gambrel roof

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will remove the rear of the Mclean House to facilitate new construction contravening the Woodbridge HCD which stipulates that heritage homes should remain intact. Mr. Rende states that the front portion of the Mclean House contains the most significant heritage attributes. While the front portion of the house represents classical design from its era, the rear portion of the house has profound historical significance as this was the location of the first doctor's office and operating room in Woodbridge (essentially, its first hospital).
<p>Aug 27/15 – Design Review Panel Minutes – 2nd Review by DRP</p>	<p>Commentary from DRP meeting minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel felt that the architectural proposal appears too big and too tall from the street level. The proposal is challenging in terms of scale, relationship to the ground plane, relationship to the upper level, and overall building articulation. The proposal does not make good use of existing grades, nor does it incorporate a historical reference to the relationship of buildings with the grade changes. In this segment of Woodbridge Avenue, the existing condition has rolling topography with buildings “floating” in the landscape. The existing cultural landscape creates transitions in grade with heritage building elevations that respond in their elevations and use to the various grades. The POPS fronting Woodbridge Avenue will be permanently in shadow. A break in the upper levels might allow some sunlight and sky views, as well as articulation of the vertical plane. Panel would have liked to review the Arborist Report as it acknowledged that the cultural landscape with existing trees is as important a part of the heritage as the buildings. 	<p>VWRPA Response to Panel Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that comments from August 27, 2015 DRP were taken under advisement by the Applicant nor were design guidelines enforced by Vaughan Urban Design. At the meeting held between residents and Manager of Urban Design and Senior Planner, comments noted in the DRP were dismissed by both, noting “<i>design is subjective</i>.” City of Vaughan set precedent for preservation of this site. The site application approval of Beaverton Homes (Kleinberg) Inc./Martin Smith House (Jun 25/13) which included preservation of topography (retention of grassy knoll) as inclusive of historical reference and significance to cultural landscape POPS – Applicant’s contribution will not be value-added due to shading from building, enclosed surroundings, lack of privacy (fish-bowl effect), amplification of traffic noise reflected off buildings on three sides. As voiced many times over by the residents, traffic is already significant on this road and will increase. Community position continues to state that the trees are integral to the preservation of the historical landscape. The Applicant’s arborist consultant originally declared the trees diseased and dying necessitating their removal. City of Vaughan Staff Report states removal of the existing mature trees is necessary to facilitate the grade changes mandated by construction of the proposed structure (i.e. no references to tree removal due to infirmity).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel noted that the review of this development should learn from previous developments along Woodbridge Avenue that have also levelled the topography and created single points of entrances that are grade separated, thereby creating a more aggressive street frontage and changing the character of Woodbridge Avenue. Panel noted that the 45-degree angular plane in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Plan is meant to adequately separate buildings and articulate a transition. Panel encouraged doing something honest with the heritage buildings. As heritage buildings consist of more than one facade, keeping the heritage houses whole was recommended. The upper levels of the building need further development; a combination of applying a similar kind of fine-grain discipline as applied to the lower portion and mitigating the height. Although the ambition is to make the top of the building visually disappear through the use of glass, Panel advised that the building will not visually disappear, especially when conventional window wall systems and exhausts are used. The balconies create a distracting upper portion, which contribute to the sense of a large building. Recessing the balconies may help in this regard. A lack of breaks and lack of finer grain in the upper levels of the architecture creates a "relentless condition" that is not typical of Woodbridge and takes away from the character of the Heritage Conservation District. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents of the area express concern that Woodbridge Avenue has lost a great deal of its village character and is becoming a concrete wall. "Mistakes" that were allowed to happen previous to this application must not be leveraged as precedent-setting to propagate further offenses to the VOP and heritage plan. The Wallace and the Mclean Houses are poised to serve the new condominium as amenities. There is no intended 'service' or added value to the neighbourhood. Woodbridge HCD Plan clearly states that the buildings remain <i>in situ</i>. The site application does not conform to the specifications as outlined in the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation Plan, particularly with respect to height and density The site application takes away from the village ambience and does not contribute to the historical character of Woodbridge Avenue. Submitted renderings are entirely incompatible with the existing personality of the village, incongruent with adjacent properties, impose a distracting sense of mass and, most importantly, are completely unsympathetic to the existing heritage homes.
Community Meetings arranged by Councillor Carella:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community meetings were held and facilitated by Councillor Tony Carella. Deputy Mayor/Regional Councillor Gino Rosati and City Staff also took part in these meetings. A small number of area residents participated in the community meetings. Only residents that presented deputations during the December 2nd, 2014 Committee of The Whole Meeting – Public Meeting were invited. With the consent of the Applicant, these meetings were recorded by the VWRPA. (Applicant provided copies). 	Community Meetings arranged by Councillor Carella:

<p>Feb 11/15 Feb 18/15 Feb 26/15 Apr 7/15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout these meetings, the residents were consistent and unanimous in their lack of support for this site application. Community input was clearly not factored in to the final design as shown during the final presentation meeting held on April 7th, 2015. Concerns that residents tabled include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. proposed architecture is incompatible with the Old Woodbridge Character landscape 2. treatment of the two Heritage homes (Thomas Wallace House (c. 1875) and the Dr. Peter Mclean House (c.1893) 3. increasing traffic on Woodbridge Ave. 4. removal of existing mature trees 5. negative and severe impact on the surrounding townhouse development 6. shadowing impact
<p>Dec 2/14 – Committee of the Whole Public Hearing</p>	<p>February 11th, 2015 - Councilor Tony Carella led the meeting. The format for the scheduling of upcoming meetings with the Applicant was also set. Residents that attended this meeting were required to submit their contact information in order to ensure they were invited to future meetings. At this time, no discussion took place about the development with the applicant.</p> <p>February 18th, 2015 - Applicant provided information about the development. Applicant addressed items such as the mature trees, shadowing impact, traffic study, architecture design. Concerns raised by residents during this meeting were deferred to the end of the Applicant's presentation. These were discussed during the February 26th, 2015 meeting.</p> <p>February 26th, 2015 - During this meeting, residents raised concerns that were not factored into the development plans. Violations of the VOP2010 and the Vaughan Heritage Plan were brought forward by the residents, at this time.</p> <p>April 7th, 2015 - Applicant provided new changes to the development. Changes included a slight decrease in the development size from 8-storeys to 7-storeys (Note: consideration was not given to overall height as the height of each storey can vary greatly). The townhomes which were part of the original application were removed from the plan and a common area "green space" was added. At this point, no other considerations were included. When it was suggested that the height was still a concern (as it still far exceeded plan) and the heritage component had not been addressed, the Applicant indicated that no further changes would be made to the design.</p> <p>At the Dec 2/14 meeting, the Community from the Village of Woodbridge attended Vaughan City Hall documenting their initial reaction to the proposed site application at 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite a driving snowstorm, over 50 residents from Ward 2 attended this meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 125 names were submitted on a petition of protest 19 deputations of disapproval were expressed to City Council 17 communications items were delivered to the City Clerk expressing disapproval of the application All deputations were harshly critical of the application particularly with respect to size, height, density, impact and conservation of the two historical homes, traffic, shadowing, green space – specifically impact to the existing trees, sightlines, and open streetscape. <p>Councillor Carella's response to the community's disapproval of the site application was to order Community Meetings with the applicant and a selection of the ratepayers who spoke at the Dec 2/14 meeting.</p> <p>Commentary from Staff Report submitted for the Dec 2/14 Committee of the Whole Public Hearing</p> <p>VWRPA Response to Staff Commentary</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To receive comments from the public and the Committee of the Whole on the following applications on the subject lands ..., to facilitate the development of an 8-storey apartment building with 143 residential apartment units, three 2-storey townhouse units, and 230 m² of ground floor commercial uses and to restore and retain two heritage dwellings (Thomas Frazier Wallace House and the Dr. Peter Mclean House), • Amend OPA #440 (Woodbridge Core Plan) to re-designate the subject lands from "Medium Density Residential" and "Mixed Use Commercial" to "High Density Residential" and to amend the following official plan policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Permit a residential apartment building with terracing ranging in height from 3 to 8 storeys, with a maximum density of 417 units per hectare (3.28 FSI) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to include 143 units Residential Apartment Dwelling Units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 Townhouse Dwelling units ▪ 2 existing Detached Heritage Dwelling units ▪ 230m² of ground floor commercial area ◦ To include total parking proposed = 168 spaces ◦ No Barrier-Free parking 	<p>Site application is located in the area of the Woodbridge Heritage District Conservation Area that should be protected by the Woodbridge HDC Plan, 6.1.1 Objectives: Generally, new buildings along Woodbridge Ave. should be no taller than 4 floors (13m) and must be sympathetic to, and transition from, the height of adjacent contributing buildings with a minimum 45-degree angular plan, starting from the existing height of the contributing building's edge. Existing contributing buildings should retain their historic setbacks, and create front landscaped courtyards that open onto Woodbridge Ave. to build on the 'green' character of the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPA #440 (in effect) The subject lands are designated 'Medium Density Residential' and "Mixed Use Commercial" which permits low rise residential and mixed-use buildings with a maximum building height of 3- storeys and density of 35 units per hectare. The "Mixed Use Commercial" designation does not prescribe a maximum density. The opportunity for a 4th storey in the roofline is permitted within the "Mixed Use Commercial" designation depending on the adjacent development. The proposal to re-designate the subject lands to "High Density Residential" to permit an 8-storey mixed-use building with a residential density of 417 units per hectare does not conform to the current and applicable Official Plan. • City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) - specifically Volume 2, the Woodbridge Core Secondary Plan - the subject lands are designated "Low Rise Mixed Use". This designation permits multi-unit mixed-use buildings with a maximum building height of 4-storeys and a Floor Space Index (FSI) of 1.0. The proposed 8-storey building with an FSI of 3.28 does not conform to VOP 2010. • This site application grossly exceeds the prescribed limitations imposed in either official plan. The applicant has no interest in developing a property sympathetic to the adjacent properties and surrounding neighbourhood; architecturally, culturally and historically. • VWRPA expressed that the Community is in support of redevelopment, however request that the applicant, Planning Department and Council respect the official plan and consider what is an appropriate fit for a neighbourhood
--	---

		<p>designated as a heritage conservation district.</p> <p>Heritage Homes – there are two heritage homes situated on these lots. In essence they are the last two homes left of the Woodbridge of yesterday. The topographical attributes of their locations (185 “Thomas Frazier Wallace House” and 197 “Dr. Peter Mclean House” Woodbridge Ave) are of great important to the Village of Woodbridge atmosphere and integral to the streetscape of the area. Relocation and removal of the additions (which are significantly old) falls the intended conservation of the area and violates the Woodbridge HCD Plan.</p>
--	--	--