

---

**Subject:** FW: Countrywide Woodend Place Application  
**Attachments:** Countrywide Woodend Place Resident Response1.docx; 2016 Vaughan Traffic Zone Estimate - update1.xlsx; Vaughan TZ Map 2001 Boundaries.pdf; Vaughan TZ Map 2006 Boundaries.pdf

**From:** DiGirolamo, Diana  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 9:51 AM  
**To:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** FW: Countrywide Woodend Place Application

**Communication for 11, 31, and 51 Woodend Place (files OP.16.003, Z.15.032 and 19T-15V011) – Public Hearing date May 3, 2016**

**From:** Joe Collura [<mailto:joe.collura@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** March-31-16 7:10 PM  
**To:** DiGirolamo, Diana; Kiru, Bill; DeFrancesca, Rosanna  
**Cc:** Tamburini, Nancy; Rossi, Melissa; Fearon, Kyle; Iacobelli, Tony; MacKenzie, John  
**Subject:** Countrywide Woodend Place Application

Good evening,

Firstly, allow me to express my gratitude for your expertise & responsiveness. Over the past several weeks I have engaged you (& many others) in completing this analysis & directional response. Your guidance has been more than helpful & I am extremely appreciative.

As committed, & in advance of the pending Community Meeting concerning the subject application, tentatively scheduled for May 3rd, 2016, please find attached a comprehensive response. The approach was objective & balanced & I trust you will agree, a reasonable recommendation. While the attached contains additional details, in summary:

...there is overwhelming information to support the declining of the subject proposal and related applications. There is simply too much that is contrary to the many policies set forth by the City of Vaughan. That said, I believe a more collaborative and thoughtful approach may produce a desirable outcome for all stakeholder. Accordingly, it is recommended:

- The subject application be declined
- That future applications adhere to the spirit of the VOP with specific emphasis on respecting and maintaining consistency our surrounding communities
- That no unnecessary rezoning be granted and instead any future development adhere to or does not deviate greatly from the existing uses permitted (i.e. single family detached)
- That reasonable density be accounted for, considering the significant growth that has been demonstrated within the immediate and surrounding communities since 2006.
- That any future development be contained to Woodend Place along with adequate density that would allow entry from Major Mackenzie alone and not infringe on Via Borghese

- That any future development respect the surrounding environment, protect all areas that have been identified, strengthen and connect protected areas and return the subject lands to its previous state or provide an agreeable compensation plan

Considering the vast lands available within the subject area, the below image demonstrates how potential development may be considered. If the City of Vaughan's Intensification target of 45% is applied to the existing community (i.e. 3 homes), it would only require one single detached home be added. That said, and with the greater needs of Vaughan in perspective including supporting reasonable growth, **a community of 80' (foot) lots can be effectively developed** which would add reasonable density and would not adversely impact the immediate area. This would maintain consistency of the surrounding communities, would not require significant zoning deviation, address environmental issues and would be closely aligned with the spirit of the VOP.



I may add to the attached response as I continue to collect & assess relevant information however, felt it was important to share early on in this process to support discussions that may be ongoing.

Finally, & in an effort to return the kindness you have afforded me & with the idea of wanting to do all we can to support Vaughan, I thought I would share some of the analysis I have completed. Among the many entities I engaged during the course of this work, York Region provided some unit, density & traffic zone (TZ) information. While much of this detail required extensive work to account for the TZ changes since 2006 & to align with the various wards, I believe it was time well spent as it helps to clearly demonstrate how growth has been allocated across Vaughan. It should be noted that the figures are very conservative as the TZ view takes into account ALL land (e.g. including Designated Greenfields) vs. what is truly developable. Acknowledging it is not perfectly aligned, it does provide health directional details. I am happy to discuss these findings as needed.

I hope this will form part of the City's review & will support a respectful decline of the subject application (in its current form). I, & I can safely say my fellow neighbours, are eagerly awaiting the pending Community Meeting at City Hall.

Thank you all once again for your attention.



Joe Collura  
118 Via Borghese  
Woodbridge, Ontario  
L4H0Y7  
Email: [joe.collura@gmail.com](mailto:joe.collura@gmail.com)  
Phone: 416-566-0640

March 31, 2016

Mayor of Vaughan and Members of Council  
Vaughan City Hall  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive,  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1

Attention: **Committee of the Whole**, **Bill Kiru**, Senior Manager of Development Planning, **Diana DiGirolamo**, Planner, **Melissa Rossi**, Manager Policy Planning, **Kyle Fearon**, Planner I, **John MacKenzie**, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, **Tony Iacobelli**, Senior Environmental Planner

Re: **Country wide Homes Woodend Place Inc.**  
**11, 31, 51 Woodend Place**  
File name: **Countrywide Homes Woodend Place Inc.**  
File numbers: **Z.15.032, 19T-15V011 and DA.15078**

I am writing in response to the aforementioned development proposal recently submitted by Countrywide Homes located at Woodend Place in Vaughan. I (along with many of my fellow neighbours) am strongly opposed to the recommendations contained within all associated applications. In reviewing the details which are significantly contrary to many existing policies, an objective approach was undertaken that took into consideration the **Application Evaluation Process** including:

- Infrastructure- storm, water and sewer
- Transportation- traffic and connections
- Land Use- compatibility with context
- Urban Design- maintaining consistency
- Natural Environment- protection of core feature

Also, in the interest of presenting relevant data to support this position, extensive analysis was completed and involved factual contributions from many levels of government (i.e. Provincial, Regional and Municipal) as well as other accountable entities including:

- Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Aurora District)
- Toronto and Regional Conservation Authority (TRCA)
- York Region Land Registry Office (Aurora)
- Taranet Express <https://www.teranetexpress.ca/csp/> (title search)
- OnCorp <https://www.oncorp.com/oncorphome/pages/business-searches-and-reports.aspx> (corporate search)

I feel compelled to preface this response by adding that I have been a resident of Vaughan for more than 24yrs and I care deeply about our city. I have supported, participated in and actively raised funds for many local causes including City hosted events like Winterfest & Concerts in the Park, organized family skate events and many other grass roots fund raising in support of the Vaughan Hospital. I am proud to see our City grow and am extremely grateful to both our municipal and corporate leadership for their contributions. I am equally mindful of the important role the community plays in this process and the valuable input it offers in balancing growth in a responsible way. In completing this analysis, the subject lands were not reviewed in isolation but rather in the context of what our local community has contributed in terms of the greater needs of Vaughan and what we can reasonably add going forward. In all cases, a collaborative approach is one that leads to meaningful partnerships and progress everyone can be proud of.

While the Planning Act does require that all submissions be reviewed which, I trust will be the case for this application, considering the glaring divergence from the existing policies, **I am confident that upon review, the Committee of the Whole along with all accountable City Planning Officials will decline the proposal in its current form.** In addition to the many findings a review of this submission will undoubtedly uncover, our analysis may be summarized into three common themes:

1. Urban Design- maintaining consistency - Significant contradiction to the Vaughan Official Plan
2. Land Use- compatibility with context - Unreasonable Intensification including unnecessary rezoning
3. Natural Environment- protection of core feature - Disregard for protected lands & vegetation identified within the Natural Heritage Network (tree removal, commitment to 30% Forest Cover from the existing 11%, compensation plan, etc...)

We trust the overwhelming findings will not only support the refusal of this application but draw attention to what appears to be questionable actions involving the subject lands. As mentioned, I care greatly about our fair City and will always support its progress when done so in a respectful and fair manner. **This is not about stopping development. Instead, this is more about supporting responsible growth!**

### Urban Design- maintaining consistency - Significant contradiction to the Vaughan Official Plan

Having reviewed the VOP in its entirety, it is apparent that there are a significant number of contradictions contained within the subject proposal. In reviewing two additional reports, "A Vision for Transformation," and "Where and How We Grow," again, there is dramatic separation from what is contained within those documents and the recommendations put forth with the subject application. It stands to reason that this disregard of existing policies are directly contributing to the sizable community outrage and rightly so! Please refer to the below images for further confirmation:


Homes within immediate community (all single detached)



Rendering of proposal (three story townhome inconsistent with community and surrounding neighbourhoods; completed towns within immediate area have increased over 284% since 2006 (per York Region Traffic Zone data) adding adequate inventory, intensification and diversity (does not include additional towns &/or apartments that have been approved or are currently under construction; further, proposal does not protect existing NHN)



Aerial I view of surrounding area (does not maintain consistency...at all!)





Referring to the Vaughan Official Plan, here is a list of the policies this proposal is either directly in contrast to &/or does not adhere to (not exhaustive):

- **Chapter 1**
  - 1.5
    - Goal 1 (...This Official Plan seeks to maintain the stability of existing residential communities,...)
    - Goal 8 (...Intensification Areas have been limited to 3% of the overall land base to protect existing Community Areas and Natural Areas.)
- **Chapter 2**
  - 2.1.3.2 e.
  - 2.1.3.2 l.
  - 2.2.3
  - 2.2.3.2
  - 2.2.3.3
  - 2.2.3.4
  - 2.2.5 (per York Region Traffic Zone (TZ) data, subject area (TZ 1039) has experience amongst the highest density growth in Vaughan since 2006 for a non-identified Intensification Area &/or Intensification Corridor (i.e. currently 54.03, an increase of 40.18 jobs/employment per hectare)
- **Chapter 3**
  - 3.1.1.2
  - 3.1.1.3
  - 3.2.1.2
  - 3.2.1.3
  - 3.2.2.1 ("maintain" the natural heritage inventory per schedule 2)
  - 3.2.3.1 a. i. & iii., b., c. d
  - 3.2.3.4 c. (considers that Vaughan has only 11% woodland cover and there is emphasis in the policy to not only maintain woodland cover, but work towards woodland enhancements and restoration.
  - 3.2.3.7 (does not meet any of the exceptions)
  - 3.2.3.8
  - 3.2.3.9 (...in the case of a development application, the application will not proceed until restoration works have been undertaken...")
  - 3.2.3.10
  - 3.2.3.11 (...minor modifications...)
  - 3.3.3.1 a. & b.
  - 3.3.3.2.a. & b. (we have not been privy to the environmental study however, how has the tree removal been factored)
  - 3.3.3.3 d. (what process was followed to address the tree removal within the NHN and how will a compensation plan be now be presented?)
  - 3.7.2
  - 3.8.1.5 (including how has tree removal been factored)
  - 3.9.2.1 (including how has tree removal been factored)
  - 3.9.2.2 (including how has tree removal been factored)
- **Chapter 9**
  - 9.1.1.8 a.
  - 9.1.1.10
  - 9.1.2.1 a. & b.
  - 9.1.2.2. a.thru g.
  - 9.1.2.3. a thru g.
  - 9.1.2.5 e.
  - 9.2.1.1
  - 9.2.1.2
  - 3.2.1.4
- **Chapter 10**
  - 10.1.2.37
  - 10.1.2.46 a. i thru vii

As evidenced by the sheer amount of policy contradictions, this proposal should be declined swiftly. An amended recommendation that respects the VOP, the environment and the surrounding community would be welcomed and a more collaborative approach would be prudent.

In addition, I note a recent recommendation (IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS COMMUNITY AREA POLICY REVIEW FOR LOW-RISE RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS FILE 15.120 WARDS 1 TO 5), submitted by Deputy City Manager, Planning & Growth Management and Director of Policy Planning and Environmental Sustainability, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016 and directionally approved by the Committee of the Whole per the extracts from the Council Meeting of March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 (pgs 49-69):

[http://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes\\_agendas/AgendaItems/CW0301\\_16\\_14.pdf](http://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW0301_16_14.pdf)

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox/15305d29d9c0c99f?projector=1>

Much of the findings and recommendations are consistent with the issues related to the subject proposal including but not limited to:

*"...the intent of VOP 2010 is for new development to respect and reinforce the established pattern and character of the area."*

*"There have been an increasing number of applications that seemingly counter the vision and intent for the stable community areas provided in VOP 2010. The intent of VOP 2010 is to ensure development respects, reinforces and is compatible with, the existing scale, lot pattern, character and form of established neighbourhoods."*

*"...proposed new policy recognizes that townhouse developments, as well as semidetached houses, are not common in most of Vaughan's long established neighbourhoods in Community Areas and if introduced would mark a significant physical change, which would be contrary to Policy 2.2.3.2.... The criteria in the proposed policy are intended to ensure that townhouse developments respect the physical character of the established neighbourhood and achieve compatibility."*

*"...development should be in keeping with the general form and character of existing development and streetscapes in the surrounding neighbourhood:*

1. *Infill development should reflect the existing neighbourhood pattern of development in terms of front, rear and side yard setbacks, building height and the location and treatment of primary entrances, to both the dwelling and the street. (Policy 9.1.2.2 / 9.1.2.3)*
2. *Development should reflect the desirable aspects of the established streetscape character. Where the streetscape needs improvement, infill development should contribute through high-quality building design, landscape architecture, and tree planting. (Policy 9.1.1.2 / 9.1.1.3)*
3. *The prevailing pattern of lot widths, lot depths and lot area in a neighbourhood should be maintained. The subdivision of a lot to create two or more lots should only occur if the width of the resulting lots is the same as or greater than the narrowest lot fronting the same street on the same block or the narrowest lot fronting the same street on the block across the street. (Policy 9.1.2.2 / 9.1.2.3)*
4. *An existing dwelling should only be replaced by a dwelling, or dwellings, of the same type (detached or semi-detached house or townhouse). (Policy 9.1.2.2 / 9.1.2.3)"*

#### Land Use- compatibility with context - Unreasonable Intensification including unnecessary rezoning

In reviewing the VOP and various schedules, the subsection applications include unnecessary rezoning, unreasonable intensification and encroachment on Natural Areas including Core Features:






The subject lands (11, 31 and 51 Woodend Place) are zoned **RR Rural Residential Zone** by Zoning By-law 1-88. Section 4.2 clearly defines uses permitted as **Single Family Detached Dwelling**.

Block 42, Plan 65M-4149, are zoned **RD2(H) Residential Detached Zone Two** (with a Holding Symbol "H" subject to Exception 9(1281) by Zoning By-law 1-88). Section 4.24 clearly defines uses permitted as **Single Family Detached Dwelling**.

**ZONING MAP FOR CONTEXT :**



**PLAN 65M-4149**




The conditions related to the "H" are as follows:

*"Lands zoned with the Holding Symbol "(H)" shall be used only for the production of field crops or a use legally existing as of the date of enactment of this By-law. The Holding Symbol "(H)" shall not be removed until such time that the City approves the adjoining lands to the west for development and identifies and allocates sewage capacity sufficient to service the lands."*

Again, this is further supported by the recent Implementation Options Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations that suggests:

*"...compatibility in low-rise residential areas along arterial streets can be achieved by respecting and maintaining the prevailing pattern of building orientation, setbacks and landscaping; and can fit compatibly within each distinct type of neighbourhood in the City."*

*"Policy 9.2.3.2(b): The proposed amendment clarifies that the policy is intended to apply to proposed new development in established neighbourhoods and ensure new townhouses are only introduced where they already exist."*



Turning to Intensification, I note:


- York Region's anticipated growth between 2006-2031 includes:
  - 1,507,480 population
  - 780,270 jobs
  - 90,720 intensification units (234,110 total units)

(Region totals currently being revised to 2036 include 1.7MM pop, 840M jobs, 105M Intensification Units (119M to 2041))

- Vaughan's anticipated growth between 2006-2031 includes:
  - 167,300 population
  - 103,900 jobs
  - 29,300 intensification units (66,180 total units; 27M add'l from 2011-2036; 31M add'l to 2041)



In reviewing the above targets and working closely with City and Regional officials, extensive analysis was completed to understand the progress that has been made including where this growth has come from geographically. York Region provided the below Traffic Zone (TZ) views (2001 & 2006 included as methodology changed over this period) along with 2006 & 2011 Census Data, Unit Completions, Employment and Developable Areas to inform these directional findings (which will be conservative as all land types were factored based on TZ views).





Per the below analysis, and with the exception of Ward 4 which has an additional 1400 hectares of developable area (55% more) and home to the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, Ward 3 has contributed the most density growth since 2006. Furthermore, TZs 1039 (subject area) and 1040 reveal significant intensification as compared to peer areas. It should also be noted that both TZs are not classified as Primary Intensification Centres or Primary Intensification Corridors yet have experienced growth well in excess of those areas categorized as such. Finally, TZ 1039 represents the third largest density increase in all of Vaughan since 2006 (40.18) for non intensification areas.

2006 Census Base															
Ward	Traffic Zone 2001	Intensification Area	Units								Population	% of Population	2006 Employment	Developable Area (Ha)	Job / Employment per Ha
			Singles	Semis	Rows	Apartments	Duplex	Total	% of Total						
	Ward 1 Totals		10922	1893	1850	498	743	15906	23%	58302	23%	14559	7188	10.14	
	Ward 2 Totals		10862	1158	516	1063	811	14410	20.72%	52341	20.99%	20754	3581	20.41	
	Ward 3 Totals		9722	1360	1299	147	717	13245	19.05%	49192	19.73%	32484	2498	32.70	
	Ward 4 Totals		3774	1140	1342		278	6534	9.40%	23983	9.62%	81362	3880	27.15	
	Ward 5 Total		12674	120	1659	3987	1003	19443	27.96%	65524	26.28%	12999	1542	50.93	
3	1039		370	76	2	2	28	478	3.61%	1800	3.66%	58	134.1	13.85	
3	1040		2008	658	373		151	3190	24.08%	11836	24.06%	1,063	229.0	56.33	

2016 Forecast by Traffic Zone (per 2011 Census Base)															
Ward	Traffic Zone 2001	Traffic Zone	Intensification Area	Units						% of Total	Population	% of Population	2016 Employment	Developable Area (Ha)	Job / Employment per Ha
				Singles	Semis	Rows	Apartment	Duplex	Total						
Ward 1 Totals				13396	2084	2460	1719	784	20443	21%	70324	22%	18075	7188	12.30
Ward 2 Totals				11543	1788	844	1889	718	16782	17%	57449	18%	35013	3581	25.82
Ward 3 Totals				13957	2034	2509	110	396	19006	20%	68060	21%	41159	2498	43.72
Ward 4 Totals				10794	1721	2882	515	170	16082	17%	56466	17%	108294	3880	42.46
Ward 5 Totals				12759	145	2279	7053	1359	23595	25%	72469	22%	18504	1542	59.01
3	1039	1039		1,762	85	10	0	2	1,859	10%	6,833	10%	415	134.1	54.03
3	1040	1040		2,111	873	661	0	26	3,671	19%	13,022	19%	1,597	229.0	63.84

Change From 2006						
Ward	Traffic Zone 2001	Traffic Zone 2006	Total Units	Total Population	Total Employment	Job / Employment per Ha
Ward 1 Totals			4537	12022	3517	2.16
Ward 2 Totals			2372	5108	14260	5.41
Ward 3 Totals			5761	18868	8675	11.03
Ward 4 Totals			9548	32483	26932	15.31
Ward 5 Totals			4152	6945	5505	8.08





It should also be noted that according to data provided by York Region, the City of Vaughan is well positioned for intensification including an additional 9,080 in known applications within the Built-Up Area and 24,800 in Designated Greenfield Area. Also, Vaughan is well funded in terms of existing units to the tune of a 14 year supply (vs. Province requirement of 10yrs) and 4 years of supply for approved units (vs. Province requirement of 3yrs)

Years of Supply in Vaughan												
Residential Unit Supply in Vaughan												
	Single	Semi	Row	Apartment	Total							
Built Up Area <sup>1</sup>	360	220	780	7,720	9,080							
Designated Greenfield Area <sup>2</sup>	10,970	1,660	4,720	7,450	24,800							
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,330</b>	<b>1,880</b>	<b>5,500</b>	<b>15,170</b>	<b>33,880</b>							
1. Supply in <b>known development applications</b> in plans of subdivision, condominium and site plan within the Built-Up Area.												
2. Supply located outside the built up area (both in applications and unit assumptions for lands designated for growth but with no current planning applications) - most of these units are in the Designated Greenfield Area (including ROPA 2) but a small number of units in the Greenbelt or with rural designations.												
Vaughan CMHC Completions 2005-2014												
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	10-year Avg	
Singles	1,009	1,227	2,314	1,723	1,349	2,224	1,279	1,095	542	765	Singles	1,353
Semis	182	208	484	292	268	278	256	70	14	42	Semis	209
Rows	191	188	593	456	125	513	401	333	312	185	Rows	330
Apts	633	177	785	473	356	967	356	565	345	776	Apts	543
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,015</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>4,176</b>	<b>2,944</b>	<b>2,098</b>	<b>3,982</b>	<b>2,292</b>	<b>2,063</b>	<b>1,213</b>	<b>1,768</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,435</b>
Estimate of Years of Supply in Vaughan												
Years of Supply	14											
Estimated Registered and Draft Approved Years of Supply in Vaughan												
Total Reg and Draft Approved Units in Vaughan	10,300											
Years of Supply	4											

Further, according to the March 2016 York Region TZ data, Vaughan has added:

- over 75,000 in population growth, ahead of its annual target of ~6,700 (167,300 2031 target)
- ~59,000 is job growth, ahead of its annual target of ~4,100 (103,900 2031 target)
- over 26,000 units since 2006, well ahead of its 2031 target (29,300)

In summary, rezoning the subject lands and allowing for further intensification would be to the detriment of the community and Vaughan at large. Instead, development that adheres to and respects the spirit of the VOP as well as all associated policies is what should be encouraged. The objective details provided including relevant commentary offered by Vaughan's very own Planning and Environmental leaders per the Implementation Options Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations, should cast no doubt as to the merits of the subject proposal and contribute to a respectful decline.

#### Natural Environment- protection of core feature - Disregard for protected lands & vegetation identified within the Natural Heritage Network

Another important consideration in completing this analysis was the care, or lack thereof, given to the natural environment. Accordingly, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Aurora District) was engaged to speak to how the subject proposal impacts **Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI)**. The below image was provided and outlines the categorized lands. While not directly impacted, it is expected any eventual development will adequately account for maintaining its environmental importance.






The Toronto and Regional Conservation Authority (TRCA) was also engaged to speak to **Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs)** and offered the follow image and response:

*"The orange hatched area represents TRCA's Regulated Area. Any development or site alteration within TRCA's Regulated Area requires a permit pursuant to Ontario 166/06. The reason why this area is regulated is because there is a watercourse (which is a tributary to the East Humber River) and associated valley corridor."*

*As prescribed in TRCA's Living City Policies, development within a regulated area must be setback 10 m from the greater of the following: (a) long term stable top of slope; (b) stable toe of slope; (c) Regulatory Flood Plain; (d) meander belt; (e) any contiguous natural features and areas that contribute to the conservation of land."*



Finally, City of Vaughan Planning and Environmental services officials were engaged to validate the **Natural Heritage Network** implications including any existing **Core features**. The following images confirm the proposed development does in fact impact the existing features including the removal of an entire woodlot that remains under investigation:

#### EXISTING SCHEDULE 2 – NATURAL HERITAGE NETWORK



#### PROPOSED SCHEDULE 2B – NATURAL HERITAGE NETWORK



What is of particular interest, aside from the questionable manner an entire woodlot was removed, is the fact that during the current review of the Natural Heritage Network, the subject woodlot was reaffirmed as a Core Feature and as such every effort should be made to preserve the inherent value, ecological features, biodiversity & connectivity of these natural features. Through the course of our ongoing investigation into this matter, via the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, we will review the details of any claim, the timing of the claim, the manner in which it was dealt with and approved including any applicable arborists report. In addition, a compensation plan for any trees found to have been removed negligently will be expected and any proposed development halted per Chapter 3, section 3.2.3.9 of the VOP.




The leveling of the subject woodlot, also identified as a Core Feature, has significantly impacted the environmental benefits of the area where it previously served to complement the Natural Heritage Network. It was explained to many residents during the Feb 17th residents meeting at city hall that Forestry Services did grant approval to remove some damaged trees caused by the 2013 ice storm. We were told this was validated by a "photo" that was provided by the owner. It was explained that the amount of damage caused by the storm placed a significant strain on city resources which, contributed to some lack of follow up. While I can certainly appreciate the extenuating circumstances, I believe there is a reasonable limit that should apply.

Living directly across from the subject lands, we immediately contacted the city for assistance when activity began. When the tree removal began, it was clear this would not be targeted to "damaged trees" considering the large machinery that was being used to essentially flatten this area! When we did speak with the city, on several occasions, we were told the trees were damaged. This, despite our making the calls while standing directly in front of the subject lands and pleading for the city to come observe for themselves as the extent of the apparent "damage" was not nearly as extensive. We also witnessed a city by-law official finally attend the site, albeit very briefly, only to be told there is nothing we can do because the trees were already cut. Per by-law 185-2007, this action was a direct violation.

Finally, I will draw your attention to the subject lands and the woodlot in question. The first photo, according to Google Earths Terms of Service, was updated after April 30, 2014. I have provided screen shot to validate this information and when it was captured (i.e. Feb 20, 2016). Per below, these trees appear to be thriving which would directly contradict the supposed damage caused by the 2013 ice storm.

The second photo reveals the same area however, that has now been decimated! According to Google Maps Terms of Service, it was updated after Dec 17, 2015. I have provided screen shot to validate this information & when it was captured (i.e. Feb 20, 2016).



I am familiar with the City's commitment to improve our forest cover from the 11% current state to a desired 30%. In addition to the suspect activity, the above actions are also starkly contrary to this effort.

Table 4: Vaughan's Natural Environment Compared to Ideal Ecosystem Targets

Ideal Ecosystem Target	Vaughan Conditions
30% forest cover	11%
10% wetland	1.9%
75% of streams with forest cover within 3 m of stream banks cover	30 %

As mentioned earlier, I have been a resident of Vaughan for many years and care very much about the state of our city. The manner in which this incident has been and continues to be dealt with, is simply not consistent with what I know is a thoughtful and dedicated city. I know, first hand, the quality of leadership we are privileged to have representing us and felt it was important to draw attention to this matter specifically as it related to the commitments made (per below) within the **Vaughan Accord**.

*"Ensure that our behaviour is at all times consistent with the City's core values of Respect, Accountability and Dedication;"*

*"Remember our history and heritage by protecting and preserving important landmarks;"*

*"And that by signing this Accord, we the elected Members of Council pledge to keep this commitment, and to serve the City of Vaughan in a manner that will reflect a positive image of the City and instill civic pride."*

*"Dated at Vaughan, Ontario, on this 20th day of January, 2015."*

### **Recommendation**

In summary, there is overwhelming information to support the declining of the subject proposal and related applications. There is simply too much that is contrary to the many policies set forth by the City of Vaughan. That said, I believe a more collaborative and thoughtful approach may produce a desirable outcome for all stakeholder. Accordingly, it is recommended:

- The subject application be declined
- That future applications adhere to the spirit of the VOP with specific emphasis on respecting and maintaining consistency our surrounding communities
- That no unnecessary rezoning be granted and instead any future development adhere to or does not deviate greatly from the existing uses permitted (i.e. single family detached)
- That reasonable density be accounted for, considering the significant growth that has been demonstrated within the immediate and surrounding communities since 2006.
- That any future development be contained to Woodend Place along with adequate density that would allow entry from Major Mackenzie alone and not infringe on Via Borghese
- That any future development respect the surrounding environment, protect all areas that have been identified, strengthen and connect protected areas and return the subject lands to its previous state or provide an agreeable compensation plan

Considering the vast lands available within the subject area, the below image demonstrates how potential development may be considered. If the City of Vaughan's Intensification target of 45% is applied to the existing community (i.e. 3 homes), it would only require one single detached home be added. That said, and with the greater needs of Vaughan in perspective including supporting reasonable growth, **a community of 80' (foot) lots can be effectively developed** which would add reasonable density and would not adversely impact the immediate area. This would maintain consistency of the surrounding communities, would not require significant zoning deviation, address environmental issues and would be closely aligned with the spirit of the VOP.





In closing, I trust the combination of the information provided including objective data along with the overwhelming community response, will support the decision to decline the subject proposal and encourage a recommendation that both respects the surrounding community and environment and is more aligned with the spirit of responsible growth.

I look forward to further discussions regarding this matter and hope to be engaged throughout the process to work closely with all accountable city officials, the applicant and the community, to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution.


Yours truly,

**Joe Collura**

Proud citizen of Vaughan and advocate for responsible growth!



# Vaughan







Keele Street

1076

Major Ma

1078

1072

1071

1070

1069

Jane Street

1056

1057

1058

1059

Highway 400

1052

1051

of John

1038

040

Road