

Subject:

re:Sept.17th Public Hearing for Revelopmer
Major Mackenzie and Pine Valley Drives

c <u>7</u>
Communication
COUNCIL: <u>Sept 26/17</u>
Cw(p) Rpt. No. <u>32</u> Item <u>1</u>

From: Leo [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 9:55 PM

To: DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>Cc: Clerks@vaughan.ca;
DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca

Subject: re:Sept.17th Public Hearing for Revelopment applications - 100 Townhouse units - at Major Mackenzie and Pine Valley Drives

Subject: OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILE OP.17.005 P.2017.22 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.17.013
Good Evening Councillor DeFrancesca,

My name is Leo Verrilli and am a resident on Via Teodoro (South East corner of Pine Valley and Major Mackenzie – across from Kortright Centre and south of Capo Di Monte)

I could not attend last week's Sept 17th Public Hearing regarding the application for 100 Townhouses at Major Mackenzie and Pine Valley.

Please consider this email a disposition for this application.

I am opposed to the amount of units that the applicant is asking for. The 100 Townhomes will add further traffic and congestion to this area – specifically on Pine Valley. I use Pine Valley Dr every morning (heading south to make a right onto Rutherford Rd) and am on the road at 6:40am and there are approx. 6 – 8 cars deep at that time making a turn. Can you imagine this line up when these 100 Townhomes are built – not including when Capo Di Monte is fully complete are all residents are moved in. The line up on Pine Valley will reach from Rutherford to Major Mackenzie!!

I have been a residence of Woodbridge for 28 years now and have recently moved – again – from Jane/Rutherford Rd to avoid the congestion to Pine Valley / Major Mackenzie – which will get very busy soon. This area cannot withstand the traffic from these 100 Townhomes.

What I am asking is that Council NOT accept Recommendation #2 in the Public Hearing Report from Staff to Committee of the Whole, which reads,

"THAT Vaughan Council deem" the applications "to satisfy the study requirements identified in Site Specific Policy 13.15 ...as it relates to lands use, urban design, environmental and heritage potential, and its location in the community ... and on this basis that staff be directed to proceed with the review" of the applications.

Instead, I would like that the Councillors reaffirm that its approval for any basis upon which staff is to proceed with a review of the applications include specific instructions for full conformity with policies 2.2.3.2, 2.2.3.3, 9.1.2.1 and particularly 9.1.2.3.

Also, I would hope direction to Staff to peer review the Applicant's technical studies and said Traffic Report, and then provide Staffs opinion on various proposed development scenarios for the lands per Site Specific Policy 13.15 for review and comment from the community, without consideration of the developer's proposed land use and configuration, in keeping with the intent of VOP2010 policy; and pending completion of which the subject applications be deemed premature.

I ask your support Councillor De Francesca, and that of the other member of staff to carefully re-consider this application

Thank you

Leo Verrilli