

Elizabeth A. Bottos

Woodbridge, Ontario

PUBLIC HEARING
COMMUNICATION

C11

Date: Sept 19/17 ITEM NO. 7

Home: [REDACTED]

Bus: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

Via Email:

developmentplanning@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan
Development Planning Department

Attention: Diana DiGirolamo

Dear Madam:

Re: Application OP 17.005 and Z17.013 ("**Application**") by Valley Major Developments Limited ("**Applicant**") with respect to 4433, 4455 and 4477 Major Mackenzie Drive ("**Lands**")

I wish to submit comments with respect to the **Application**.

My husband and I are purchasers of condominium in Capo DiMonte located at 9909 Pine Valley Drive, Vaughan, which is immediately to the south of the **Lands** which are the subject of the **Application**, and as such have an interest in the development of the **Lands**.

My comments are as follows:

A. Density

I submit that the density of the **Application** is excessive for the following reasons:

i. Block Frontage

The **Application** indicates that there will be a maximum of 8 attached residential units per block. The plans seem to indicate somewhere between 6 and 8 townhouses per block. The **Applicant** requests a reduction of lot frontage per block from 30 meters (98.43') to 25 meters (82.02'). Taking into account the exterior side yard setbacks of 3 meters (9.84') (and also assuming the side yard setbacks are not further reduced) we are left a frontage of 72.18' to accommodate between 6 and 8 townhouses. Where there are 8 townhouses they will be only 9.02' wide. Where there are only 6 townhouses they will only be 12' wide. This is far too dense and completely out of keeping with the area.

ii. Unit Owner Parking

It would appear from the plans that there are approximately 34 units with single car garages and 56 with double car garages. The plans do not indicate the size of the garages, but based on the requested reduction in frontage, I am concerned that the size of the garage would not be sufficient to accommodate a normal sized vehicle together with the usual items reasonable people store in their garages (such as bicycles, sports equipment, tools, green bins, blue bins, garbage bins etc.). It also appears from the plans that some of the driveways (if they can be called driveways) are only 1.74 meters (5.72') which is hardly sufficient space to park a normal motor vehicle. My concern is that this will result in parking issues within the development. There is no alternative parking available. It would be extremely dangerous for vehicles to attempt to park on the shoulder of Pine Valley Drive and Major Mackenzie Drive.

iii. Interior Common Element Road Width

I understand that the road servicing the townhouse development will be a private road which will be a common element. The plans indicate that this road is only 8 meters (26.24') in width. Standard road allowances were always 66' wide and as of the past few years this standard has been reduced to approximately 57'. The proposed road is substantially below even the reduced standard and will not be able to safely accommodate two-way traffic, snow removal, emergency vehicles, seniors walking with walkers, children walking to get to school or school buses or to the amenity area and mothers walking babies in strollers. I also question where the snow plows will put the snow when they shovel it away and where unit owners will put the snow that they have to shovel in front of their garages to get out.

iv. Visitor Parking

The **Applicant** seeks to not only reduce visitor parking from 25 spots to 20 which is a 20% reduction but also to reduce the size of visitor parking spots from 6 meters to 5.9 meters. Couple this with the limited unit owner parking noted aforesaid and I submit the result will be parking chaos in this development which will create serious safety issues for all of the residents.

v. Amenity Area

I question whether this rather small amenity area is sufficient to accommodate a play area and an area for outdoor activities for all of the children in the development as it appears that they will have no other place to play safely. Also, I am concerned that there is a way for children to get from their townhouse to the amenity area in a safe and secure manner. I am unable to determine whether the development includes sidewalks for this purpose but if it does not I would suggest that sidewalks should be required.

B. Effect on the Community

I submit the following comments on the **Application** insofar as it effects the neighbouring community:

- i. Pine Valley Drive is a very hilly, narrow road with no sidewalks and very limited shoulder of the road. Can Pine Valley Drive safely support the additional car and

pedestrian traffic generated by another 100 homes and the construction vehicles necessary to develop, serve and build these 100 homes and school buses which will be needed in the future to bus the children from these homes to school? Given that the Pine Valley link is not going to open with the result that Pine Valley Drive becomes a dead-end road at Rutherford Road, it cannot be considered to be an arterial road and cannot safely support a significant increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

- ii. I understand that Major Mackenzie Drive is slated for road widening from Pine Valley Drive to Islington Avenue in the near future. This will be a major project which will take a significant period of time and will cause substantial upheaval to the traffic pattern in the area. In an effort to minimize the detrimental impact on neighbouring residents, will steps be taken to ensure co-ordination of the road widening and construction on the **Lands**, so that both are not taking place at the same time?

I do plan to attend the meeting on September 19th, 2017, the Meeting of the Committee of the Whole to re-iterate the concerns that I have set forth in this letter.

Yours very truly,

Elizabeth A. Bottos

Elizabeth A. Bottos