

| |
|----------------------|
| c 4 |
| Communication |
| CW: <u>Sept 2/14</u> |
| Item: <u>24</u> |

35 Honeywood Road,
Thornhill Woods
Vaughan, L4J 9C2

August 27, 2014

City of Vaughan
Development Planning Department

Dear Sirs/Madams

**OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILE OP.13.013
ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.13.036
ISLAMIC SHIA ITHNA-ASHERI JAMAAT OF TORONTO
WARD 4 - VICINITY OF BATHURST STREET AND RUTHERFORD ROAD**

Because I am unable to attend the open Council meeting scheduled for September 2 at 11am I wish to submit my written comments on the report prepared by the City staff that has been attached to the agenda for this meeting.

While I am encouraged by the progress that has been made between the developers, the residents association, other interested parties and the City, I remain concerned that some of the key issues remain unresolved. This negotiating process appears to have been protracted and it is apparent that the developers have still not addressed the core long term planning direction of the City. I am aware the Regional Council has rejected the developer's original application and I would have expected that by now the City would also have adopted the same position. It would appear the City is still allowing the developers as much time and latitude to structure their development plan to suite their own self-interests as opposed to abiding by the regulations adopted by the City to protect and serve the interests of all its residents.

I as a resident of the Thornhill Woods make strong objection to the following proposals included in the report:

Under no circumstances should the City permit a building that exceeds five to six levels as a maximum and provided the number of structures and units proposed can be supported by the infrastructure already in place to service the area.

A road traffic study must provide conclusive evidence that the increase in the proposed density will not adversely affect congestion and that sufficient parking has been provided to accommodate this proposed increased population in the area without continuing to overflow into the neighbouring streets.

A separate above ground parking structure should not be allowed as such a building is neither aesthetically appealing nor desirable in a residential area. It would be preferable to ensure that adequate below ground parking is provided with separate direct access to the main arterial road in order that it does not congest the narrower side roads.

The access Apple Blossom through road into Bathurst must be retained in order to support the increased traffic and to provide relief for the only other two through roads, Summeridge Drive and Autumn Hill that are currently servicing the area.

The developers must provide the City with a written guarantee that all residential units will be made available to the general public and may not be offered exclusively to only a certain religious group. This policy is offensive and not within the true spirit of the Canadian way of life.

Any structures that are intended as subsidized housing must retain certain building standards that will not distract from the quality of housing units in the surrounding area.

I firmly believe that the only way to expedite this process is for the City Council to reject this application and suggest to the developers that once they have addressed all the objections to their application they would be at liberty to re-submit their application.

Sincerely

Leon Chonin

Copies: Sandra Racco
Cindy Furfaro
Preserve Thornhill Woods Association