

**From:** Bernie Divona <berniedivona@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 02, 2015 9:44 AM  
**To:** Moore, Kathryn  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing West Woodbridge Village Towns Ltd.

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

C 40	
COMMUNICATION	
CW (PH) -	SEPT 9/15
ITEM -	5

Hi, further to our conversations, you have requested I put in writing the various questions both myself, a relative that has purchased a property, and my neighbours have with the Notice we have received. It is my understanding you will co-ordinate and provide an immediate response based upon the timing of the meeting plus the number of requests to date. Please address every matter at your earliest opportunity as we all have concerns.

1. The original plan was to include the "56 freehold towns", and retain the existing historical home. Question: the OP that was approved was for "freeholds" and NOT "CONDOMINIUM" properties. Under a "freehold" you own and maintain a property and under a "condominium" you own general floor to ceiling or within a defined lotline and SHARE space? Why did the development plan and report not disclose it was not a true or complete "freehold" or should the application had been returned and recirculated?
2. The original plan disclosed it was a "freehold" development which is one housing choice, and generally and primarily "freehold" towns are constructed with public standards ,i.e. public roads, and public services. The original report and drawings did provide for private vs. public roads and servicing. Was this your understanding, and if so, how would a "freehold" owner have known based upon the report they were not getting what was traditionally or is traditionally a "freehold"? Please be specific.
3. I have a relative that has asked me for assistance or direction. The City of Vaughan did OP, Zone, Draft Plan, issue a building permit, and construction has commenced and will be completed for some units, and only NOW , the draft plan of condominium is before the public and residents. Yet, upon reflection the OP and Zoning, already allowed for a condominium. Question: Did a NOTICE OF HEARING go to those that have purchased, with or without conditions to the agreement, receive NOTICE OF THE PUBLIC HEARING? Fundamentally, "notice" is given to registered owners and we have "registered buyers" that may or may not know they would be subject to a bastardized development not being a traditional "freehold"? Please be specific.
4. The city has circulated an application, that they know or ought to have known is a significant change from what was approved as buyers having had a choice in housing options selected "freehold" and NOT CONDOMINIUM, and in a very real sense they have to have a shared use from the property line, road, servicing, park, and visitor parking, etc. They would have budgeted for home expenses and now have condominium expenses while not being called a condominium. Did the prior approval disclose this to any prospective buyer or investor?
5. When we spoke I expressed to you I was surprised to have learned the subject property includes EXISTING DETACHED HOMES ON GORDON DRIVE. Appendix 2 as you had noted with me, shows several properties rear lots to be added to the subject West Woodbridge Village Towns development.
  - a. Was there a consent application or severance to add the property to the development? I have owned the property on Gordon and have never received nor have never seen any signs to show a committee of adjustment consent application?
  - b. Are the properties on Gordon that have now had a large chunk of their rear lot severed, comply with bylaw 1-88 as the properties on Gordon are R3 zoned and have a specific MININIUM AREA. Please be specific.
  - c. The properities on Gordon have not changed the rear lot line with any fencing change so we have an application that differs from the actual. Can you please explain.

C40.2

6. The Kipling Area Study had these lands to be R3 and it was implied to have been transitional with lands to the south. Are we to understand that the subject lands are transitional and north are subject to intensification?
7. When we spoke , it was clear the city of Vaughan does not have a specific zoning code or class for CONDOMINIUM, OR MIXED USE CONDOMINIUM WITH RETAIL OR COMMERCIAL WITH HIGHRISE CONDOMINIUM as we now see approved and under construction. How does the existing OP and Zoning address this lack of class as now exists with other municipalities? The class now implies it is “freehold” or intensification and NOT CONDOMINIUM. We do NOT OBJECT to condominium as it is a housing option desirable to many. However, we do object to the lack of clarity and disclosure with what is said NOT TO BE A CONDOMINIUM WHEN IT LOOKS LIKE, DESIGNED, AND BUILT AS A CONDOMINIUM.
8. The new planning act calls for review of the zoning bylaws every 3 years. Will this be within that review?

Bernie DiVona