

C 2.1

September 2, 2014

City of Vaughan, City Clerk's Office  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive,  
Vaughan, Ontario  
L6A 1T1

C 2	
COMMUNICATION	
CW (PH) -	SEPT. 2/14
ITEM -	8

**To the Committee of the Whole**

**RE:** Comments regarding Draft Plan of Subdivision for Block 40/47  
**File Numbers:** Z.06.064 & 19T-06V12

**Preamble**

My wife and I are the landowners at 10320 Pine Valley Drive, which is located to the south of Omega Developments. Together with our neighbors, David Toyne and Gillian Evans of 10240 Pine Valley Drive, we have concerns regarding the development along the southern border abutting our properties which we have outlined in previous letters to the City.

Over the past year, we have discussed those concerns with the Block 40/47 Developers Group, TRCA, municipal planning staff, regional planning staff, and our ward councilors. The result of those discussions was the relocation of proposed townhouses along the south border, and special provisions in a modified OPA 744 for a buffer along the south border abutting the Evans property (Special Provision Area 1 or SPA1).

We feel that the current proposed Plan of Subdivision for the lands owned by Omega Developments fails to accomplish the provisions in the modified OPA regarding a buffer. Furthermore, the buffer should be reviewed and agreed upon by all relevant parties before a Plan of Subdivision should be considered.

**Definition of Buffer**

The provision for a buffer along the southern border in the modified OPA 744 was to manage the development along edges between different land uses and densities. However, the buffer is inconsistently drawn and inadequately described in the most recent drawings distributed with the Proposed Plan of Subdivision. In Attachment 3, there is no buffer shown in the plan along the southern border. In Attachment 4, a buffer along the southern border is shown, but it is not dimensioned. The scale of the drawings do not allow for the information relating to the proposed buffer to be clearly understood or evaluated.

C2.2

From our perspective, it seems premature to propose the subdivision of the lands before the buffer has been defined; the dimensions, grading and planting of the buffer are features that will impact the development surrounding it. All development limits should to be clearly defined, reviewed with the city and the affected landowners, and agreed upon before SPA1 is sub divided.

We also have no clear direction on how the grading will be resolved to eliminate the use of retaining wall elements and where these fall relative to the buffer and/or within the subdivision.

Furthermore, we do not view the current buffer proposal as a sympathetic solution. Although the municipal planning department put forward suggestions for how the buffer could manifest, there are no prescriptive requirements listed in the modified OPA 744. Therefore, we were anticipating more discussion with the landowner and the city planners to determine what would constitute an appropriate buffer prior to any work relating to the subdivision of the lands.

To start the discussion, we have provided the following comments and suggestions regarding the current subdivision proposal for Special Provision Area 1:

#### **Subdivision of Lots Along Buffer**

The Draft Plan of Subdivision in SPA1 divides the lands uniformly into a series of 40-50' wide regardless of position. As a result, the edges of the development are indistinguishable from the development in the center. This type of planning presumes the subdivision abuts another similarly developable parcel of land. It does not take into consideration that the 200+ acres that make up 10240 Pine Valley Drive are significant Valley Lands protected by the Vaughan Official Plan and the Ontario Greenbelt Act. These lands will remain largely unchanged long into the foreseeable future; therefore the proposed development should be planned in a manner that is respectful of those lands

It would assist with the transition along the southern edge if larger estate-size lots are located along the south border. This would create a gradation of density instead of an abrupt transition. Creating estate size lots along ravines and other protected natural features is a successful and sensible planning strategy that has been implemented in many other residential subdivisions in the GTA.

#### **Fence**

The applicant has put forward a minimum solution to the privacy matter relating to the south border. That includes a fence on the

C 2.3

property line of 1.8M height and one row of trees on the subdivision side.

We consider the fence height to be inadequate, and request that a study be completed to determine an appropriate fence height between residential and agricultural land uses given the geography of the site.

Furthermore, we are concerned that the fence will create a maintenance legacy for the owners at 10240 Pine Valley Dr. To avoid any maintenance costs or liabilities relating to this fence, the fence should be located 100% on the subdivision land with title requirements to maintain the fence.

### **Trees**

A tall fence along the entire edge of these naturally protected lands will appear foreign and abrupt. Instead, trees should be planned on both sides of the fence along the south property line. All trees should be planted on the Omega Development lands as the buffer should be provided by them as part of the subdivision proposal. The fence should be screened with vegetation to maintain the natural character of the lands and to also assist with maintaining visual and acoustic privacy. The need to place them on the south side of the fence is also to further protect the visual screen from individual subdivision landowners who may choose to clear the trees on their side of the property in the future.

There may be an opportunity to partner with the TRCA to plant some native and endangered tree species along this buffer.

In closing, the buffer should not be regarded as simply another development hurdle to be crossed off. These affected lands are vast in size, and have significant natural and heritage value. It is our hope that the applicant and the city planners take efforts to blend the border, and maintain a lasting greenbelt appearance along the abutting edges beyond minimum solutions.

Best regards,

Francesco and Brenda Di Sarra  
10320 Pine Valley Drive, Woodbridge