

C_6 Communication COUNCIL: Sopt 26 17 CW Rpt. No. 31 Item 10

Michael Melling michaelm@davieshowe.com

Direct: 416.263.4515 Main: 416.977.7088 Fax: 416.977.8931 File No. 440016

September 25, 2017

Urgent: By E-Mail Only to rose.magnifico@vaughan.ca and Clerks@vaughan.ca

His Worship Mayor Maurizio Bevilacqua and Members of Council City of Vaughan 2141 Major Mackenzie Drive Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

Your Worship and Members of Council:

Re: Site Plan Application and Minor Variance Requests

City File No. DA.17.021

Item 10, City Council Meeting of September 26th, 2017

Sevenplex Developments Inc. ("Sevenplex")

7990 Highway 27, Woodbridge City of Vaughan (the "City")

I write to you on behalf of our clients Mazzen Holdings Inc. and York Region Condominium Corporation No. 1161, adjacent property owners, to express concerns with and opposition to the Sevenplex applications.

- The site of the proposed development is undersized in both frontage and area for the uses proposed. It is simply not capable of accommodating this level of development.
- 2. The number of variances is a function of the substandard site size, and would permit over-building. The magnitude of the variances when considered together results in significant adverse impacts.
- Variances are required for parking, gross floor area, setbacks, landscape strips, etc., all contributing to an over development of an undersized lot. On a small lot, there is a greater expectation that the proposed configuration of development will comply with zoning in order to ensure that it does not result in unacceptable impacts.
- Sufficient landscape buffers should be maintained to provide adequate screening consistent with the desired prestige employment area character.
- The rear yard variance is inadequate to provide acceptable building separation from adjoining properties, thereby creating an unacceptable



impact on those properties, which are entitled to the protection of a proper building separation from their flankage yards.

- 6. The variances sought for an increased size of eating establishment and additional convenience store area result in inappropriate siting of the car wash; it just can't fit elsewhere. The car wash could be properly situated elsewhere on the site if the other proposed buildings were not oversized relative to the By-law and the site.
- 7. The car wash is not appropriate as close to the neighbouring properties as proposed. The By-law requires 22 metres a very significant difference from the 4.5 metres proposed. The links to videos below clearly demonstrate the very significant difference in impact on adjacent properties from the noise and emissions from a car wash depending on separation distance. The car wash should be required to be located in accordance with the By-law's 22 metre setback, or removed from the proposal entirely.

4.5 m: https://photos.app.goo.gl/kRFYsneBJIFLfcpH3

For these reasons, our clients strongly urge you to refuse the proposed site plan, or at the very least, to defer it until the requested variances have been finally granted by the Committee of Adjustment and/or Ontario Municipal Board.

Please ensure that this letter is delivered in advance of tomorrow's Council meeting to the Mayor and all Councillors.

1

Yours sincerely,
DAVIES HOWE LLP

thael Melling

MWM:md