

April 19, 2021

**Ms. Stephanie McVittie**  
**Acting Manager, Development Review Services**  
**Town of Caledon**  
6311 Old Church Road  
Caledon, ON,  
L7C 1J6  
E: stephanie.mcvittie@caledon.ca

**Ms. Elaine Leung**  
**Community Planner**  
**Town of Caledon**  
6311 Old Church Road  
Caledon, ON,  
L7C 1J6  
E: elaine.leung@caledon.ca

SENT BY EMAIL

Dear Ms. McVittie and Ms. Leung:

**RE: Caledon Town File No.: 21T-17006C, RZ 17-09**  
**Proposal for 0 Mount Pleasant Road (Laurelpark Inc.)**

---

We understand that the proponent (Laurelpark Inc.) is proposing to rezone the lands located at 0 Mount Pleasant Road (west side of Mount Pleasant Road, south of Old Church Road) in order to implement and create eight (8) estate residential lots for single detached dwellings. Yesterday night, we received notification that this matter will proceed to Planning and Development Committee tomorrow.

We reside at 31 Diamondwood Drive, immediately north of the proposed development (we share a fence line with this proposed development). We have been living in the area for eight years now. We moved to Caledon to start a family in this unique and beautiful setting, full of natural beauty and rolling hills. What drew us to this spot were the breath-taking views from our property and the surrounding drives, the protected natural environment surrounding the area, and the peace of mind knowing that we were in a healthy environment. We are hopeful to remain here for the long term.

Based on our review of the proposal material, **we would like to provide the following comments and concerns with this proposal:**

- **Visual Impacts and Privacy** – Our backyard comes to a steep rise over the proposed development which means that we will now be able to see down into many of the future developed lots. While we appreciate that there is an environmental / open space block being proposed, there are not many mature trees in this area to block the future view. As such, we ask that the proponent place more mature trees (not seedlings), adjacent or close to our common shared fence line to provide future privacy. As mentioned above, we chose this site to build our house due to the views and the environmental protection around this site, and they will now be negatively impacted. *We feel this could be better mitigated.*
- **Cul de Sac Entrance** – One of the reasons we chose to reside on this particular street, was the ability to be on a protected, quiet cul de sac with minimal activity. We understand that the development will now have three additional driveways at the end of the cul de sac and an

entrance feature for the “shared common element access to lots 1-3” which Section 3.2 “Proposed Development” of the Urban Design Brief prepared by John G. Williams Limited describes “will be distinguished through use of masonry piers, and landscape elements to demarcate the enclave entry from Diamondwood Drive”. Our understanding is that this entrance feature is yet to be designed. These three new driveways will represent potentially 50% more traffic on the cul de sac then we have today. The proposed driveways are at the shared access are very long and awkward looking. *We would like to ensure that the residents at the end of the cul de sac on Diamondwood Drive (including ourselves) have some feedback into what is appropriate and approved for this entrance feature, and that consideration is put into the design of the future driveways to ensure that they appropriately blend in or are somewhat hidden from view so as to not take away from the cul de sac nature of the drive.*

- **Architectural Control** – Another reason we chose to reside on this particular street, was the promise that the houses in this area would be strictly architecturally controlled. Section 5.3 “Architectural Character, Materials and Colour Palette” of the Urban Design Brief prepared by John G. Williams Limited makes the same suggestions for the proposed development. However, sadly, history would show that this did not happen appropriately on Diamondwood Drive, as evidenced by some of homes which are completely out of character in both colour palette and style with the rest of the subdivision. *We hope that there can be stronger controls on this in the proposed subdivision prior to approving final designs for the homes.*

The Planning Rationale Report by IBI Group stated that “the policies of the Province, Region of Peel and Town of Caledon .... [provide for permissions to] allow for estate residential development on the conditions that the environmental and rural setting is maintained and preserved.” Based on all the three above-noted comments in our letter, we ask that the proponent implement our suggestions into their proposal prior to the Town of Caledon approving any form of zoning, since we, as direct neighbours, have concerns with this proposal, its’ impact on us and its’ ability to appropriately maintain the estate residential character and setting of this neighbourhood. We would be happy to discuss these suggestions and concerns with the applicant if they would like to reach out to us. Thank you again for consideration of our comments.

Yours truly,



Matt Bedernjak

31 Diamondwood Drive, Caledon, ON, L7E 4H6

cc. Allan Thompson, E: [allan.thompson@caledon.ca](mailto:allan.thompson@caledon.ca)  
Jennifer Innis, E: [jennifer.innis@caledon.ca](mailto:jennifer.innis@caledon.ca)  
Ian Sinclair, E: [ian.sinclair@caledon.ca](mailto:ian.sinclair@caledon.ca)  
Nick DeBoer, E: [nick.deboer@caledon.ca](mailto:nick.deboer@caledon.ca)  
Lynn Kiernan, E: [lynn.kiernan@caledon.ca](mailto:lynn.kiernan@caledon.ca)  
Annette Groves, E: [annette.groves@caledon.ca](mailto:annette.groves@caledon.ca)  
Johanna Downey, E: [johanna.downey@caledon.ca](mailto:johanna.downey@caledon.ca)  
Tony Rosa, E: [tony.rosa@caledon.ca](mailto:tony.rosa@caledon.ca)  
Christina Early, E: [christina.early@caledon.ca](mailto:christina.early@caledon.ca)