

C 30.1

C 30
COMMUNICATION
CW (PH) - FEB 2/16
ITEM - 2

From: Alexandra Battiston [mailto:abattiston@hotmail.com]

Sent: January-29-16 10:18 AM

To: Jeffers, Judy; Clerks@vaughan.ca

Subject: Re: Applications with respect to 30 Nashville Road, Kleinburg - File Nos.: OP.15.005 & Z.15.024

Hello Ms. Jeffers & Clerks,

Further to my letter to you dated January 20, 2016, please see below additional questions I have with respect to the proposed development at 30 Nashville Road.

Thank you,

Alexandra Battiston Tatone
40 Nashville Road
Kleinburg, ON
L0J 1C0

Questions for planners at the City of Vaughan:

Question 1:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.1.1. i. states "Ensure that land use and built form are compatible with the scale and character of the existing community and integrated with the existing and contemplated pattern of development of the surrounding area."

Has a study of the adjacent buildings been done?

My findings show Development in surrounding area (at adjacent lots) has the following stats:

1) FSI average of 0.2

2) Building height Less than 7M

This is not compatible with proposal:

1) FSI 1.35 and height 12.5 M

Is this plan considered compatible by the city with such difference, if so, why?

Question 2:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.1.1 b. iii) states to " Ensure core area development complements existing development in overall size and scale."

Adjacent lots have lot coverages all below 20%, and have front street setback of over 7M. The proposal is indicating Lot Coverage of 44%(B188 is 30%). Does the city consider these comparative stats complementary, if so why?

C 30.2

Question 3:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.1.1. b. vi.) states "Encourage mixed use at a modest scale".

Has a study been done on the scale of adjacent buildings?

What is considered modest scale, this building is more than 15 x the size of all adjacent buildings (i.e. most buildings are 200SM while 30 nashville proposes 3000SM)?

Question 4:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.1.1. b. xiii) states "Ensure neighboring developments are physically compatible and respect existing development conditions, scale and building placement"

Has a comparison of size been made to the adjacent buildings?

How does this development ensure physical compatibility when there is such a difference, all surrounding building are 200SM vs this building at 3000SM.

Height of all adjacent buildings is no more than 7M, this building is 12.5 M.

Lot coverage of all adjacent buildings is under 20%, this building proposes 44%.

Question 5:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.4.2. states "Residential infilling within the Village shall be permitted subject to conformity with the Urban Design provisions of this amendment and provided the proposed lot development is compatible in size shape and configuration with adjacent lots and the development located thereon:

How is this proposal compatible?

a) in size when it all adjacent buildings are 200SM vs this building at 3000SM.

b) in Height, all adjacent buildings are no more than 7M, this building is 12.5 M.

c) Lot coverage of all adjacent buildings is under 20%, this building proposes 44%.

d)Have a FSI of 0.2 vs this building proposing 1.35

e)All adjacent building have perimeters that are more than just one rectangle, this proposal is one big rectangle.

Question 6:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013)12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.4.3. States "In establishing the standards within the Zoning By-Law, the scale and massing of the historic development and the existing natural landscape shall be considered." This proposal fails to satisfy all of the tree protection zones ('TPZ'as stated in its submitted arborist

C 30.3

report), the underground parking interferes with requirements to preserve and protect vegetation.

The rear setback is 7.5M vs required, which is 15M (by law 1-88).

How do all these variances satisfy "considering existing natural landscape and the historic development"?

Question 7:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013) 12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.7.1. a) states "Development Standards : Mainstreet; commercial; all development shall be subject to the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan";

How does this comply when variances are so large to existing scale of historic village.?

b) states "generally not exceed a maximum achievable building height of 9.5 M; 30 nashville proposes 12.5M; what validates this variance?

ii) states that "have consideration for the scale, massing and use of existing development of abutting or adjacent properties:

How do the following comparisons have consideration for adjacent properties?

a) in size, when all adjacent buildings are 200SM vs this building at 3000SM.

b) in Height, when all adjacent buildings are no more than 7M, this building is 12.5 M.

c) in Lot coverage of all adjacent buildings is under 20%, this building proposes 44%.

d) in scale, when all adjacent building have a FSI of 0.2 vs this building proposing 1.35

e) in geometry, when all adjacent building have perimeters that are more than just one rectangle, this proposal is one big rectangle.

Question 8:

The Vaughan Official Plan for Kleinburg Core (AS APPROVED BY THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON DECEMBER 2, 2013) 12-4 site specific area plan:

12.4.9.1. Urban Design states, " design policies set out general criteria for for the development of public and private lands within the core area and include:

predictable and consistent built form in keeping with the existing scale and massing of the buildings within established commercial and residential areas"

How is this proposal considered consistent when:

a) in size, all adjacent buildings are 200SM vs this building at 3000SM.?

b) in Height, all adjacent buildings are no more than 7M, this building is 12.5 M.?

c) in Lot coverage, all adjacent buildings is under 20%, this building proposes 44%.?

d) in scale, all adjacent building have a FSI of 0.2 vs this building proposing 1.35?

e) in geometry, all adjacent building have perimeters that are more than just one rectangle, this proposal is one big rectangle?