



From: Mike Fil [mailto:████████████████████]

Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 11:59 AM

To: Clerks@vaughan.ca

Cc: Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Ferri, Mario <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Rosati, Gino <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Singh, Sunder <Sunder.Singh@vaughan.ca>; lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Racco, Sandra <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Shefman, Alan <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; info@preservethornhillwoods.com; thornhillcentre@gmail.com; marina leikin <████████████████████>

Subject: OPA File OP.13.013, Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.13.036 - Islamic Shia Ithna-Asheri Jamaat (ISI) of Toronto – Vicinity of Bathurst Street and Rutherford Road

In case I'm not given a chance to present my position in person at the meeting April 4, 2018, please consider the below email as a public written Communication with respect to the subject matter (i.e. a deputation), which will be considered by the Committee of the Whole at its meeting on Wednesday, April 4, 2018

Regarding the Committee of the Whole Report, April 04, 2018

Report highlights says "Staff recommends approval of Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Files" "as the proposed development ... is considered to be compatible with the surrounding existing and planned land uses, subject to the recommendations and conditions in this report"

In fact the Report:

- does not contain sufficient base to consider the Application compatible
- does not give the whole truth and relevant details
- does not contain enough conditions to make it compatible
- does not correctly identify the proposed development as inconsistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014, which is contrary to the Section 3 of the Planning Act

Regarding the traffic and zoning

I live in the neighborhood since 2003. For many years, way before the construction works started on Bathurst, there was and still there is a morning traffic jam along the Bathurst from Rutherford to Highway 7 and further to Finch. That's the route I take every working day, so I know. And the cars make a shortcut through the neighborhood, and you cannot stop them.

The Committee of the Whole Report tells me they've got the Study from the Owner prepared by Crozier & Associates Consulting Engineers that says that traffic will be acceptable. It tells me there were "**concerns**" about the traffic voiced by the neighborhood. What it does not tell me that there was an independent traffic consultant presented to the City by Preserve Thornhill Woods Association who sat down with the City traffic Department and pointed to the numerous problems in Owner-supplied study. And the Committee's Report still cites the Owner's study as a proof of acceptability.

I am not a traffic specialist, but I know how to add 2 and 2. If the area was planned as a low-rise zone, and becomes a mid-rise zone with a school, the traffic swirls and gets worse. And my taxes instead of things the City already needs will be wasted to remedy for this. The Committee Report says "density bouncing". And the traffic will not get worse than planned? Really?

And the Committee Report is trying to tell me that a short corner-cutting connection from Apple Blossom to another small neighborhood street will remedy the problems. Unbelievable.

We have 2 competing views of traffic consultants, and one of them is wrong. I suspect the wrong is the Owner's report that says 2 plus 2 is still 2, that says that I see a traffic jam every morning only in my dreams. (Did they do measurements on a day when the schools were closed, perhaps? Just accidentally?).

Should the City trust the report prepared by the company hired by the Owner, with errors and problems, found both by independent traffic consultant and by simple observation and logic?

The City must ask the body that licensed Crozier & Associates to look into their report and determine if their license must be revoked. The City must ask the authorities to open a criminal investigation, whether there was a false evidence intentionally supplied to the City.

Regarding the parking structure

The Committee Report mentions a 3-level parking structure. No conceptual elevation is included. Build it however ugly you want. Build it however tall you want.

Multilevel over-ground parking structures are usually built near the malls or transportation hubs or hidden between buildings, not in the middle of a low-rise residential area. Because it is ugly.

When I was buying my house from the builder in 2003, I could not chose the elevation I want, because the street would not look nice with it. This Owner is given a free hand. Build ugly, destroy traffic, provide light pollution, other residents will pay.

This is against Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. Section 1.4.3 - "Housing", point b): "promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use lands, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities (etc.)". 3-level over-ground parking in the middle of a low-rise residential area is not efficient use of land. It destroys the surrounding community instead of benefiting it.

About Water and Sewage for the development

We all understand that the low-rise residential area puts less load on Water and Sewage than mid-rise with a school. Again, "density bouncing". Who is going to pay for that extra? Again, the City with my taxes?

I demand

- That the City Council disregard the Committee Report as baseless
- That the City Council reject the Application, because it demands an exception for the Owner in the form of re-zoning and so on, and that exception puts an unbearable and undue burden on the City, the tax payers and the Vaughan residents , and is inconsistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014
- That the City Council fire for incompetence the Deputy City Manager **Jason Schmidt-Shoukri** who authorized the Committee Report, **Carol Birch**, planner, and **Stephen Lue**, Senior Planner, who prepared it
- That the City Council start the investigation on how this report was possible and who of other City employees have composed it. They must be fired for incompetence as well.
- That the City Council approach the body governing and or licensing those Crozier & Associates Consulting Engineers traffic experts who signed the Owner's traffic Study to the city, so that their license to be revoked.
- That the City Council ask the authorities to open a criminal investigation on the Owner, Crozier & Associates Consulting Engineers traffic experts and the City employees possibly involved in knowingly supplying and accepting the Owner's traffic study with false statements.

Regards,
Mike Filatov,
Thornhill Woods,
[REDACTED]