

MARTO DIWARDO  
C32  
Item 19.

c 32
Communication
cw: <u>Sept 2/14</u>
Item: <u>19</u>

Members of the Committee, I draw your attention to Attachment 3 to Item 19. The application, in its original form, proposed 6 lots, not 5 as shown---two lots at the west end (still labeled Lots 1 and 2) and four at the east (Lots 3 to 6), all under 18m wide, with a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m, a minimum required lot area of 500m<sup>2</sup>, and a proposed lot coverage increase from the permitted maximum of 35% to 40%.

Although the applicant has withdrawn a few of his initial requests (reducing the total number of lots from 6 to 5), he is still requesting amendments which are incompatible with the existing neighbourhood. Specifically a reduction to 15m from 18m in the minimum lot frontage of Lots 1 and 2 and the minimum front yard setback of 4.5m from 7.5m for Lots 3 to 5 will seriously alter the existing streetscape.

Due to the negative impact the setback would have to the existing streetscape of APPIAN WAY, the Planning Department is not recommending any front yard setbacks of 4.5m. We support that recommendation, and thank the Planning Department.

But the residents also want to ensure that the reduction of the minimum lot frontage on Lots 1 and 2, from 18m to 15m, is not approved. We would like the Staff and Council to protect the residents of Appian Way, who purchased homes in the neighbourhood with the understanding that lots in the immediate area would be consistent and compatible with the existing lots---not just in terms of front yard set-backs of 7.5 m but in terms of frontage widths as well. Why should R2 frontages and widths be permitted in a very small neighbourhood with existing R1 frontages and widths?

I ask the Planning Department to take this opportunity to help a very anxious community, and re -think its support for the reduction in minimum lot frontage from 18m to 15m, for Lots 1 and 2. If the reduction on these two lots is approved as staff is recommending, we believe that the applicant will then appeal to the OMB the reduction in the front yard setback from 7.5m to 4.5m.

**And believe me, Member of the Committee, this is how it will play out:**

Once before the OMB, the applicant will argue that if the City Of Vaughan's Planning Department did not see anything wrong with supporting a 15m lot frontage on lots 1 and 2, then what would be the problem with the original application of 4 Lots of 15m of frontage on the rest of the lands? **In effect, what the applicant plans to do is use the refusal of one thing he wants (4.5 m setbacks) as an excuse to go to the OMB, and once at the OMB, use staff's support of 15m frontages on Lots 1 and 2 at the west end to get an extra lot (Lot 6) on the east end.**

Don't be fooled! Approve just one 30 m lot at the west end, not two of 15 m, and let the applicant work with the owner of the highly-developable 30 m lot to the north. They can come back together with a proposal for three 20m lots, and everyone of the residents of the existing neighbourhood will believe the members of this committee are planning geniuses!

Do the right thing!!!

Thank you!

\*

COURT

\*

\*

- (o) The Vendor and Purchasers shall agree to a restriction as to the future development of Block 7, the Zanette Lots and all other lots/blocks within the Plan, such that development thereon will be restricted to the City of Vaughan's R1 single family dwelling-zoning as per the Zone Requirement Table By-Law 1-88 in effect today, attached as Schedule "C". No future change in By-Law 1-88 shall affect the definition of R1 single family dwelling-zoning. This provision shall not be registered on title to any of the properties;

\*

OCT

\*

GET ON IN PROGRESS.

(c) The Vendor covenants, warrants and represents as of the date of the Miragliotta