

May 17, 2013

City of Vaughan

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive

Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

|               |             |
|---------------|-------------|
| C             | 5           |
| COMMUNICATION |             |
| CW (PH) -     | MAY 21 / 13 |
| ITEM -        | 3           |

---

RE: OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR WARD 1 – VICINITY OF KEELE AND BARRHILL

---

Honoured Council Members,

We are writing to express our objection to the proposed development located at 9850 Keele Street, which lies adjacent to the north side of our home.

Upon reviewing some of the reports that have been submitted by the developer to the staff, we noted that the developer clearly gives the impression that our property will be redeveloped. This is outrageous.

The proposed 10 units are simply not acceptable for the following reasons.

- While we would prefer a single-dwelling home built at that site, we are also reasonable and understand Council's aim in building up the existing infrastructure to ensure a sustainable tax base. Out of respect to Council we would be comfortable with a 4-unit town house development.
- The proposed development calls for a condominium road running adjacent and perpendicular to our property. This will have a negative impact on our safety, security, quality of life and property value. We did not build our home to have the noise and pollution generated by the private and visitor vehicular traffic of ten residences impact our quality of life, our safety and our privacy. We did not build these home to be T-boned by another road.
- Our upstairs bedroom and our kitchen windows face the proposed road. As it stands now, the developer has no substantial plan for mitigating the impact of street and property lighting from the proposed unit streaming into our bedroom and kitchen.
- We do not believe that the landscaping and ornamental fence proposed in the plans are sufficient to protect our home from the traffic on the condominium roadway; nor is it effective as a barrier to the noise and fumes.

- Noise is a significant factor. The number of units proposed in the plan and the services their new owners will require: such as air conditioning and garbage, will affect among other things local noise levels and odours and consequently the quality of life and enjoyment of our property – as well as the effect on the usage of the park. Their noise feasibility study just addresses the noise levels on their lot and does not address the impact of their noise on others.
- Regarding basic items such as garbage service, the more people on the lot, the more difficult it will be to keep clean and maintain.
- The Access Study as of April 15, 2013 submitted to City of Vaughan Transportation Depart claims that plans for long term modification include redeveloped of our lots (our own and that of our parents) which is expressed on pg. 2 and pg. 9 of the report . This grievous error is can also be seen on Page 8 where there is a site drawing that shows the extension of the condominium road well onto our property. This significant error calls into question the integrity of this report to council and should be re written without reference to redeveloping our property. It is our property and we have no intention to move or redevelop the property. We find this outrageous that they should even be considering our property and presenting this to Council. We built these new homes only eight years ago.
- To further aggravate this error, the Storm Management Report and the Functional Servicing Report dated April 18 also shows our homes (our own and that of our parents) as the site for the development.
- Another significant error can be seen in the Design Brief by Ware Malcomb. This document describes our homes as semi-detached. Again, another significant error because they are fully, detached single-dwelling homes. Thus, the design presented to the City gives the impression that we have set a precedent for multiple residences on one property.
- According to the 2006/2011, census data our neighborhood is predominantly comprised of single family detached homes. The families in these homes have a medium income of about \$98000 with an average of 3.3 persons per house. The homes have an average value of over \$600,000. Any redeployment should not have a negative effect on these demographics or change the essential nature of the community.
- The smaller units do not encourage longer-term home ownership and have a high potential for being purchased as investment properties and offered for rent. Rental units would have a severely negative impact upon your neighbour's property values.
- We could support four units, as the price point would encourage home ownership. In addition, we feel the large units would allow for the appropriate number of parking spaces for vehicles and potential guests, less the potential of noise and other inappropriate by products that a dense development would bring.
- Impact on the park and trees of adjacent properties, to meet the number of units the plan has pushed the units too close to our property line which may place undue stress on the trees adjacent to the property – including the park. In fact, we are also very concerned over the health and well-being of our mature walnut tree which may be fatally damaged during construction.

- We also insist that the building architecture be fully in compliance with heritage rules and regulations.
- We also insist upon high quality and attractive landscaping between our properties to ensure full privacy and not less than a six foot brick wall erected between our properties at the expense of the owner.

In conclusion, we are grateful to you for your vision and leadership and the opportunity to share our concerns. We believe that this report is too fraught with errors that call it into question and it should therefore be sent back to Planning Staff for review.

Sincerely,

Bill and Jana Manolakos

9838 Keele Street

Branko and Karin Dzeletovic

9838 Keele Street