COMMUNICATION CW (PH) - July 20 2017

From: Carella, Tony

Sent: June-20-17 11:31 AM

To: 'Steve Woodhall'; Clerks@vaughan.ca

Cc: Cardile, Lucy

Subject: RE: Development application - 31 and 55 Mounsey Street

Steve, I understand your concerns. However, you should know the following:

- 1. The Planning Act permits the amendment of official plans as the result of an application for an Official Plan Amendment or OPA (the receipt of which application a municipality cannot refuse) and which in turn becomes the subject of a public hearing at which those in favour and those opposed to the application can voice their opinions. You may attend the hearing on this matter when it takes place; however, I shall forward your comments to the Clerk, so that they become part of the public record, and so that you may be informed of the progress of the application once formally received at the public hearing (e.g., when, after a technical review by planning staff, the application comes back to the Committee of the Whole with a recommendation for approval or refusal).
- 2. Applications of this sort typically include a study of the proposal's impact on local traffic. This issue, as well as issues relating to noise, shadows, servicing, etc. are all part of the technical review
- 3. Whether the application is ultimately refused (or approved), anyone can appeal Council's decision to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), which then becomes the final approval authority, overtaking the city's planning process.
- 4. The OMB is bound to make a decision based on provincial policies, in this case respecting "intensification" and "infill". Essentially, since the creation of the Greenbelt, the province has mandated that more development must occur within the existing urban boundaries (defined as where services such as sewers and watermains stopped when the Greenbelt Act came into effect), rather than beyond those limits, in so-called white belts. The argument is that existing infrastructure can bear more development. Whether this is true when it comes to roads makes that point debatable, as you rightly point out.

From: Steve Woodhall

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 11:08 AM To: DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca

Cc: Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; Villageofwoodbridge info <info@villageofwoodbridge.ca>

Subject: Development application - 31 and 55 Mounsey Street

I recently learned of the following application to be proposed at the street address of 31 and 55 Mounsey Street (file # OP.16.012 and Z.16.051).

Looking at the proposal this is very concerning given the possible precedent it could set for future development if anything like this were to be accepted. Once again we have a proposal that completely ignores the Official Plan. The height, density and sheer size of the project is nowhere near any of the guidelines and is completely out of place for the location.

Another concern is the added stress this would cause on an already taxed transportation infrastructure, that being Clarence Road. The traffic on Clarence Road is already at a breaking point and the intersection of Clarence and Woodbridge Avenue is already way

above capacity during rush hour. The poor residence that live along Clarence road are now at a point where they can't even get out of their driveways.

Please reject this application.

Regards,

Steve Woodhall

