

Subject: FW: Letter Regarding Community Area Policy Review
Attachments: Letter to City of Vaughan_Hayhoe - OPA.pdf

C 6
COMMUNICATION
CW (PH) - NOVEMBER 1, 2016
ITEM - 2

From: Joe Balderston [<mailto:jbalderson@bruttoconsulting.ca>]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2016 11:27 AM
To: Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Abrams, Jeffrey <Jeffrey.Abrams@vaughan.ca>; Fearon, Kyle <Kyle.Fearon@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Justin Malfara <jmalfara@bruttoconsulting.ca>; Claudio Brutto <cbrutto@bruttoconsulting.ca>
Subject: Re: Letter Regarding Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations

Dear Sir,

Apologies, see attached.

Regards,

Joe Balderston, BURPI
Planner

Office: 6-999 Edgeley Blvd, Vaughan On L4K 5Z4
Tel: (905) 761-5497 | Cell: (416) 409-6112 |
Email: jbalderson@bruttoconsulting.ca

From: Joe Balderston
Sent: October 31, 2016 11:24:53 AM
To: maurizio.bevilacqua@vaughan.ca; jeffrey.abrams@vaughan.ca; kyle.fearon@vaughan.ca
Cc: Justin Malfara; Claudio Brutto
Subject: Letter Regarding Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations

Good Morning,

As Planning Consultants for the owners of the lands located at 61-83 Hayhoe Avenue, please refer to the attached letter expressing our opinions and concerns regarding the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations re: November 1st, 2016 - Public Meeting.

Regards,

Joe Balderston, BURPI
Planner

Office: 6-999 Edgeley Blvd, Vaughan On L4K 5Z4
Tel: (905) 761-5497 | Cell: (416) 409-6112 |
Email: jbalderson@bruttoconsulting.ca

Brutto Consulting

999 Edgeley Blvd - Unit 6
Vaughan, ON L4K 4Z4

Tel. (905) 851-1201 Fax (905) 761-9890
info@bruttoconsulting.ca

October 31, 2016

Mr. Mayor Maurizio Bevilacqua, and Members of Council

Mr. Jeffrey A. Abrams , City Clerk

Mr. Kyle Fearon, Planner 1

City of Vaughan

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive

Vaughan, Ontario, L6A 1T1

**Re: Submission Concerning the Community Area Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential
Designations re: November 1st, 2016 – Public Meeting**

Dear Sir,

We are the Planning Consultants for the owners of the lands located at 61-83 Hayhoe Avenue, Vaughan. On behalf of our Clients we are submitting the following letter to express our interest and concerns having regard to the City of Vaughan's Low Rise Residential Policy Review. Included herein is a general overview of our concerns to the proposed policies within the Draft Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study and Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations Report dated January 2016.

Overview of Low Rise Residential Policy Review VOP 2010

Included within the Low Rise Residential Policy Review are two components that we have concerns with. The first component relates to proposed policies that apply to new development within "Large Lot Areas" whereby the second components relates to new development fronting onto arterial roads. These concerns have been identified in greater detail within the following sections of this letter.

Additional clarification and clarity is required to the Draft Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study and Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations Report dated January 2016, to address new forms of development, including developments fronting arterial roads, and proposed lots having greater density, built form, and/or decreased lot sizes than those of the surrounding area.

Proposed Amendment to Policy 9.2.3.1

Policy 9.1.2.4 included within the Draft Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study states that all new dwellings (semi-detached & townhouse dwellings) shall have frontage onto a public street, and that laneways or private driveways shall be discouraged. The following policy requires further consideration and clarity as infill developments having frontage onto, and requiring access from an arterial road have not been appropriately considered.

In the event of lots fronting onto arterial roads, the City of Vaughan and Regional Municipality of York will typically discourage multiple driveways intersecting with the roadway. In turn, a private driveway parallel to the arterial roadway is required to permit said developments. Policy 9.2.3.1 shall consider this.

Moreover, section 9.1.2.4 expresses that parking for units fronting on an Arterial Street shall be located at the rear of units or underground. This often at time is not feasible for low density developments such as semi-detached and townhouse dwellings. Parking at the rear of the dwelling will further reduce rear yard private amenity space for residents and will force each unit to be closer to the roadway, further reducing privacy for residents, and potentially aiding to increased noise and light disturbances stemming from vehicle traffic. It is our recommendation that parking shall still be permitted within a front yard garage and driveway, as this helps establish a suitable front yard setback, and has no impact on surrounding land uses.

Lastly, Policy 9.1.2.4 proposes that the scale and massing of townhouse developments shall respect the scale and massing of adjacent development and any applicable urban design guidelines. Given that Policy 9.1.2.4 addresses semi-detached and townhouse built forms, further clarification and direction is required for the scale and massing of semi-detached dwellings.

Proposed Amendment to Policy 9.1.2.3

The proposed policy amendment to Section 9.1.2.3 of the Official Plan speaks to the character of existing established neighborhoods and how new development shall be structured. More specifically the proposed policy states that “In the case of lot creation, new lots should be equal to or exceed the frontages of the adjacent nearby and facing adjoining or facing lots, or the average of the frontage of the adjoining lots where they differ.”

In our opinion, this policy will limit the possibility for intensified land uses even if they are found to be compatible with the existing surrounding uses. In respecting large-lot neighborhoods it is acknowledged that a transition between any built form should be warranted. Contrary to the proposed policies of Section 9.1.2.3, the compatibility between two different types of built form in our opinion can be achieved without limiting lot sizes to that of the existing uses. Examples include but are not limited to, increased setbacks between lower and higher density uses, limitations to building height, vegetation buffers, or a transition in lot widths, with the largest lot being adjacent to existing large lots.

Proposed Amendment to Policy 9.1.2.4

Lastly, proposed Policy 9.2.3.1 states that "In established Community Areas where Detached Houses and Semi-Detached Houses exist, with existing development, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of new Detached Houses and Semi Detached Houses will respect and reinforce the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved Detached Houses and/or Semi-Detached houses of the same type in the immediate area. Variations are permitted for the purposes of minimizing driveways."

In respect to this policy further direction is required to address how the scale, massing, setback and orientation of new detached dwellings or semi-detached dwellings will be determined if the surrounding area is comprised of only one type of built form, be it detached dwellings or semi-detached dwellings.

Furthermore, this policy is restrictive, as this level of direction in our opinion is more appropriate to be addressed through the Zoning By-law. Keeping in touch with the basis and intent of Policy 9.2.3.1 the scale, massing, setback and orientation of new Detached Houses and Semi Detached Houses should be appropriate, desirable, and compliant with the land use and built form characteristics of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

In turn, it is of our opinion that the proposed policies within the Draft Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study and Policy Review for Low-Rise Residential Designations Report dated January 2016 should recognize the concerns and opinions expressed within this letter.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Respectfully,



Claudio P. Brutto, MCIP, RPP
President
Brutto Consulting