

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
1E	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Malone Given Parsons Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 61 West</p>	<p>Request revisions to Schedule 9 Future Transportation Network:</p> <p>1) Inconsistencies in relation to OPA 699, with respect to the alignment of Huntington Road, MacGillvary Road, and Major Mackenzie Drive.</p> <p>2) Schedule 13F Land Use: Inconsistencies in relation to OPA 699, with respect to the area identified for a 10 storey permission and the translations of units per hectare in OPA 699 to FSI in Volume 1.</p> <p>Volume 2: 3) Request that the Region's approved version of OPA 699 be included in Volume 2.</p>	<p>1) These issues have been reviewed by staff and the appropriate changes to Schedules 9 and 13-F will be made.</p> <p>2) The boundary of land area devoted to 10 storey buildings will be adjusted to reflect approved OPA 699.</p> <p>3) The final approved version of OPA 669 be reflected in Volume 2.</p>	<p>1) That Schedules 9 and 13-F be amended to reflect approved road alignments for Huntington Road, MacGillvary Road and Major Mackenzie Drive in accordance with approved OPA 699.</p> <p>2) That Schedule 13-F be amended to accurately depict the boundary limits for 10 storey buildings in accordance with OPA 699.</p> <p>3) No change required.</p>
7C	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: West of Jane St & north of Bass Pro Mills Dr</p>	<p>1) Request to be exempt from the Secondary Plan requirement applicable to the lands.</p> <p>2) Comment that built form requirements not appropriate in an OP level.</p> <p>3) Note that "High-Rise Mixed Use" designation permits high-Rise and mid-rise buildings but should also be allowed to permit low-rise buildings as well.</p>	<p>1) The covering staff report includes a recommendation (1.b) that would allow the applications to proceed.</p> <p>2) Built form flexibility is provided for in Section 9.2.1.2 – minor variations from the policies of 9.2.3 shall not require an amendment to this Plan provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	<p>1) See Recommendation 1b) in the covering staff report.</p> <p>2) and 3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>3) The High-Rise Mixed-Use designation is proposed primarily in Intensification Areas, well served with existing or planned transit. Low-Rise buildings are permitted within transition areas to Low-Rise Residential and on local streets in the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p>	
<p>7D</p>	<p>DATE: June 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan Mills Primary Centre- West side of Jane Street</p>	<p>1) Request that Casertano and Mammine development applications be exempt from the Secondary Plan requirement.</p>	<p>1) The covering staff report includes a recommendation (1b) that would allow the applications to proceed.</p>	<p>1) See Recommendation 1b) in the covering staff report.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>8B</p>	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Weston Road Vellore Local Centre</p>	<p>1) Draft OP proposes "Mid-Rise Mixed Use" with maximum H-6 and D-2. Recent resubmission conforms with the proposed maximum density but not with the proposed maximum building height of up to 12 storeys. If resubmission does not find favour with Council, the original submission with buildings up to 22 storeys in height and density of 2.5 FSI would be reinstated and therefore request "High-Rise Mixed Use" designation.</p> <p>2) Note that size and shape of the Local Centre does not appear to correspond to Chicchino's lands.</p> <p>3) Comment that an OP should incorporate general objectives related to built form, and specific numeric requirements should be placed in guidelines objectives and ultimately, in site-specific zoning by-laws.</p> <p>4) Note that current language in the OP would result of denying jurisdiction for the Committee of Adjustment to approve minor variations in numeric standards in future zoning by-laws</p> <p>5) Note that "High-Rise Mixed Use" designation permits high-rise buildings</p>	<p>1) On July 13, 2010, Council approved applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law (Files OP.08.010 and Z.08.039). Schedule 13-H will be adjusted to reflect the approved height (12 storeys) and an FSI of 1.6.</p> <p>2) The size and shape of the Mid-Rise Mixed Use designation on Schedule 13-H will be adjusted to reflect the lands.</p> <p>3) Built form flexibility is provided for in Section 9.2.1.2- "minor variations from the policies of 9.2.3 shall not require an amendment to this plan provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City."</p> <p>4) Given the flexibility provided for in section 9.2.1.2 the Committee of Adjustment will not be required to consider amendments to the built form policies.</p> <p>5) The High-Rise Mixed-Use designation is proposed primarily in Intensification Areas, well served with existing or planned transit. The High-Rise Mixed-Use designation is proposed primarily in Intensification Areas, well served with existing or planned transit. Low-Rise</p>	<p>1) That Schedule 13-H be amended to reflect a maximum building height of 12 storeys and an FSI of 1.6.</p> <p>2) That the Mid-Rise Mixed Use designation on Schedule 13-H be amended to reflect the shape and size of the subject lands.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>and mid-rise buildings but not low-rise buildings. Request some flexibility to permit low-rise buildings in the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p>	<p>buildings are permitted within transition areas to Low-Rise Residential and on local streets in the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: R.G. Richards & Associates</p> <p>LOCATION: Rutherford Road Market Place, at north-west corner of Bathurst and Rutherford Road.</p>	<p>1) Request confirmation that interpretation of Major Retail in Community Areas section in Draft OP is correct.</p> <p>2) Site is currently permitted a food store, drug store, pharmacy, personal service, restaurant and banks, and financial institutions. Request assurance that these uses are still permitted in Draft OP, as they are not explicitly stated.</p>	<p>1) Proponent requesting that current development rights through recent OPA 689 to permit more than 10,000 sq.m of retail on a site be recognized. Section 5.2.3 of the VOP does not permit over 10,000 sq. m of retail in Community Areas.</p> <p>2) A definition for retail uses is proposed as follows:</p> <p>"retail shall mean retail, restaurants and service commercial uses".</p> <p>This definition will cover the retail permissions in OPA 689.</p>	<p>1) The retail Gross Leasable Area of 26,800 sq.m and the retail uses permitted by OPA 689 be included in Volume 2, as a site-specific permission.</p> <p>2) A definition for retail uses is recommended as follows:</p> <p>"retail shall mean retail, restaurants and service commercial uses".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
12A	<p>DATE: May 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Chippewas of Rama</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Members of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nations acknowledges receipt of letter of April 12, 2010.</p> <p>Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor is coordinator</p>	<p>The letter from the William Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nations acknowledges receipt of notices sent by the City of Vaughan for consultation. No specific comments are provided.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
12B	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Chippewas of Rama</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Members of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nations acknowledges receipt of letter of May 19, 2010.</p> <p>Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor is coordinator</p>	<p>The letter from the William Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nations acknowledges receipt of notices sent by the City of Vaughan for consultation. No specific comments are provided.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
14A	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Land Law</p> <p>LOCATION: 8100 Yonge Street</p>	<p>Comments to New Vaughan Official Plan include:</p> <p>1) Policy 1.3 - Statement is premature until City demonstrates is financially feasible.</p> <p>2) Policy 2.1.1.1 - Have not seen any information showing population distribution by reference to various lands within intensification areas or any land budget.</p> <p>3) Policy 2.1.3.2(b) - How is the anticipated future population to be distributed in the intensification areas?</p> <p>4) Policy 2.2.1.1 c(iv) and 2.2.1.2 - These policies and Schedule 1 conflict with land use designation in Schedule 13-T.</p> <p>5) Policy 2.2.3 - Should provide for flexibility to implement the intensification objectives of the OP along the edges of the Community Area.</p> <p>6) Policy 2.2.5.10 - What is the planning rationale for limiting the intensification areas to only "one property depth" along the corridor, specifically to those existing "commercial lots of record".</p>	<p>1) The City has prepared its Official Plan to meet the Growth Plan targets established by the Province and the Region of York. The City's Official Plan must implement the mandated targets assigned by the province of Ontario through the Region of York and therefore regardless of the findings of a Fiscal Impact Study, the City is mandated to accommodate the growth assigned by the Region of York.</p> <p>The City will continue to monitor the fiscal impact of the master plans over time. The Official Plan must be updated every five years, and the financial plan set out in the Development Charge background Study must be updated at least every five years.</p> <p>2) and 3) The Where and How to Grow document June, 2009, provided a residential capacity analysis and land budget exercise associated with the preparation of Vaughan's new Official Plan. It establishes the framework and basis for a continuing discussion about Where and How to Grow in Vaughan to 2031, leading up to a new Official plan.</p> <p>This is consistent with the York's Official Plan and the Province's Places to Grow:</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p> <p>12) Recommend Policy 7.3.3 be amended to read "intensification may place increased pressure on existing parks."</p> <p>13) No change is recommended.</p> <p>14) No change is recommended.</p> <p>15) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>7) Policy 4.1.1.2 - Modal split of 50% a lofty goal.</p> <p>8) Policy 4.1.1.4 - By limiting the intensification areas along the Yonge Street intensification corridor to existing "commercial" lots of record, you cannot maximize the use of existing and planned infrastructure.</p> <p>9) Policy 7.3.1 - Provision of parkland over of a below grade garage or other structure, is necessary.</p> <p>10) Policy 7.3.1.3 - Not all new urban parks need to be maintained in public ownership.</p> <p>11) Policy 7.3.2.2 - Insert reference to the provision "surface strata parks".</p> <p>12) Policy 7.3.3 - Statement should be supported by some form of quantitative analysis.</p> <p>13) Policy 7.3.3.2 - Suggest policy that is in line with Toronto rates 10-15% land value cap.</p> <p>14) Policy 7.3.3.7 - Add new provision to f) "the provision of public parks through a</p>	<p>the Growth Plan for the Golden Horseshoe. Many of the intensification areas have been the subject of recent detailed planning studies that examine the appropriate land uses, height and densities.</p> <p>4) The land use designations along the Yonge Street Corridor have been assigned based on the Steeles-Yonge Corridor Secondary study.</p> <p>5) The intensification objectives for these lands will be implemented through the Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan.</p> <p>6) The northern study area along the Yonge Street corridor does not have sufficient lot depths that will provide a buffer between adjacent low rise residential land uses and future development along Yonge Street.</p> <p>7) Policy 4.1.1.2 states: "That public transit shall be the primary focus for expanding Vaughan's transportation network capacity to 2031. Consistent with the York Regional Official Plan, an overall transit modal split of 30% during the peak periods is targeted for the City as a whole and transit modal split of 50% is targeted for Intensification Areas".</p>	<p>16) No change is recommended.</p> <p>17) No change is recommended.</p> <p>18) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>conveyance of a fee simple interest in land or the conveyance of an easement for a public park".</p> <p>15) Policy 9.2.1.7 - No height or density established on subject property. Subject lands also incorrectly designated "Low-Rise Mixed Use" as surrounding lands are high-rise.</p> <p>16) Policy 9.2.1.8 - Clarify.</p> <p>17) Policy 9.2.3.5 - Add flexibility on cap (12 storeys) for mid-rise buildings.</p> <p>18) Policy 10.1.3.2e) - Policy too vague.</p>	<p>8) Intensification Areas are priorities for transit investment. Policy 4.1.1.4 also states; "Land –use planning decisions within Intensification areas shall maximize the use of existing and planned transit infrastructure, taking into account the planned level of transit services and potential impacts on nearby neighbourhoods. As previously noted in Issue 6 above, the northern Study Area along the Yonge Street corridor does not have sufficient lot depths that will provide a buffer between adjacent low rise residential land uses and future development along Yonge Street.</p> <p>9) and 11) "Surface strata parks" are not considered in the OP as they would be considered "encumbered".</p> <p>10) Any new park must be conveyed to the City of Vaughan and held in public ownership in order to be receive parkland dedication credit. Otherwise parcels will be considered amenity/courtyard space;</p> <p>12) Consideration shall be given to revising the statement to read "intensification may place increased pressure on existing parks..."</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>13) The City's parkland dedication rates are consistent with other area municipalities in the GTA, no changes to the policies are contemplated.</p> <p>14) We do not agree with including this statement in order to be considered public park the lands must be conveyed to the City of Vaughan to receive parkland dedication credit.</p> <p>15) The lands are part of the Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan which will identify height and density for the lands.</p> <p>16) The statement is clear. For example, if a development proposal meets the maximum building height, but not the prescribed FSI, the shortfall can not be used to justify additional building height.</p> <p>17) Additional building height may be possible through the Bonusing provisions in Chapter 10.</p> <p>18) The policy currently exists in the City's Official Plan. Policy 10.1.3.2 refers to a number of different application processes. Depending on the application, issue, location different</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			information may be needed and will will identified at the Pre-Application Consultation meeting(s).	
14B	DATE: June 15, 2010 RESPONDENT: Land Law LOCATION: 8100 Yonge Street	Objects to the lack of Parkland Dedication provisions which are not capped.	The Parkland Dedications provisions in the Official Plan conform to the requirements of the Planning Act. See Comment under Item 14A(13).	No change is recommended.
15	DATE: June 07, 2010 RESPONDENT: Deb Schulte LOCATION: Jane Street and	1) Concerned that the Public Hearing Report identifies no economic impact. 2) Concerned with any proposed residential development on the lands. Wishes to see services and development that will support the hospital.	1) The Public Hearing Report for any planning matter typically does not identify the Economic Impact. This may be considered in the Committee of the Whole Report if relevant. The Economic Impact section in a City report typically refers to budget implications arising from the initiative discussed in the report,	1) and 2) No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Major Mackenzie Drive		<p>once known, (eg. if further study is needed there may be a need to budget for additional consultant funds).</p> <p>2) No residential uses are proposed by the Healthcare Campus Centre Official Plan Amendment. The easterly portion of the lands will be subject to a future study at which time the appropriate uses will be determined.</p>	
16A	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Canadian Petroleum Products Institute</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Concerns raised related to OP policies respecting gas stations.</p> <p>1) Policy 4.3.3- Travel demand management. Proponent describes the evolution of the service station to a larger one-stop-shopping facility providing a range of retail services besides gasoline.</p> <p>2) Policy 5.2.3- Supporting and Transforming the Retail Sector. The proponent outlines the benefits of drive-throughs, including for people with disabilities. The proponent requests that since gas stations are permitted in High-Rise Mixed-Use areas generally located within Intensification Areas where drive-throughs are prohibited under the proposed Official Plan, then since gas stations have expanded their services to</p>	<p>1), 2) and 3) The Official Plan proposes incremental policy measures to discourage car dependence and promote pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive compact built form in designated Intensification Areas.</p> <p>4) Street-oriented buildings support a comfortable, safe and convenient pedestrian-oriented public realm as well as transit and are therefore a key policy for Intensification Areas. Policies within the Official Plan require that where the retail portion of a gasoline station is greater than 100 square metres, it should front at least one public street.</p> <p>5) Gasoline stations are permitted along arterials where car volumes are greatest; however, intersections that serve as key gateways into the city and components</p>	<p>No change to proposed drive-through policies in the draft VOP is recommended, except the following:</p> <p>4) In recognition of the unique gas station typology an exception from the requirements of Policy 9.1.2.5 e) is recommended to allow for parking between the front face of a building and the public sidewalk.</p> <p>In light of the concern regarding the limitation on location options on arterial roads the following change is recommended to Policy 5.2.3.7, replace second sentence with:</p> <p>"In addition to and in recognition of Intensification Areas and Heritage Conservation Districts which are already subject to a prohibition of drive-through</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>include drive-throughs ancillary uses, drive-throughs should likewise be permitted in Intensification Areas.</p> <p>3) Policy 5.2.3.4- The proponent asserts that since drive-throughs are often an ancillary use associated with retail uses whose primary location will be in Intensification Areas, then drive-throughs facilities should be permitted in those areas.</p> <p>4) Policy 5.2.3.7(f)- Drive-throughs. The proponent is opposed to policies in Intensification Areas that require buildings to be oriented to the public street with direct pedestrian access, as they would not work with industry gasoline station site planning standards.</p> <p>5) 9.2- Land Use Designations and Permitted Buildings Types (9.2.2.4 (b), 9.2.2.6 (b) High-rise mixed-use, 9.2.2.7 (b), 9.2.2.10 (b), 9.2.3.9 (d), Schedule 13). The proponent is opposed to policies that restrict the number of gasoline stations along arterial roads and that existing operations become legal non-compliant within the proposed policy regime.</p>	<p>of city building are required to preserve a pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive character and form. The new Official Plan will recognize existing gasoline station uses.</p> <p>The proposed drive-through policy in Volume 1 of the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan is consistent with existing City secondary plan policies in the Maple, Thornhill, Kleinburg-Nashville, Woodbridge Heritage Conservation Districts, Carrville and Vellore District centres as well as the Steeles West Corridor that do not permit drive-throughs in areas where a pedestrian oriented and compact built form is promoted. The draft Plan continues the prohibition of drive-through uses in Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and in three (3) other intensification centres and along intensification corridors through Highway 7, Bathurst Street, Rutherford Road, Yonge Street and Major Mackenzie Drive. The policy does not prohibit drive-throughs in other areas of the City. The policy is part of a coordinated city and regional approach that includes a review and reduction of parking standards, a new approach to City building espoused by Volume 1 of the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan</p>	<p>facilities, it is intended that the prohibition shall also pertain to all Intensification Areas except Primary Intensification Corridors that are not Regional Corridors as identified on Schedule 1."</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			and investments in higher order transit.	
16B	DATE: July 05, 2010 RESPONDENT: Canadian Petroleum Products Institute LOCATION: Vaughan	Follow up letter to reiterate the importance of service stations and the need to ensure that the population continues to be adequately served in Vaughan. Information is provided about the number of service stations in Vaughan and other municipalities to demonstrate service levels.	See Comment under Item 16A.	See Recommendation under Item 16A.
17B	DATE: May 14, 2010 RESPONDENT: Bratty and	The parkland dedication requirements in the draft OP will discourage higher density residential units. Need a more balanced approach with respect to overall parkland dedication	Section 7.3.3.2 sets out the parkland dedication requirements in accordance with the provisions in the Planning Act. A number of municipalities in the GTA utilize similar parkland dedication rates	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Partners</p> <p>LOCATION: 7777 Weston Road</p>	<p>requirements.</p>	<p>as the City of Vaughan.</p>	
<p>17C</p>	<p>DATE: May 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bratty and Partners</p> <p>LOCATION: 7777 Weston Road</p>	<p>The property is subject to a site-specific development application.</p> <p>1) A concern is expressed that the Official Plan requires a Secondary Plan for the lands at Highway 7 and Weston Road and that this requirement effectively freezes development for any application currently in process.</p> <p>2) The proponents recommend that the Official Plan process is far enough along that the specific application can proceed through the development approvals process.</p>	<p>1) The lands are located in the Weston Road and Highway 7 area which is identified on Schedule 14 as an area subject to a Secondary Plan requirement. A Secondary Plan is a valuable planning tool used to review planning issues. Given the location of the lands on a regional intensification corridor and a short distance west from the VMC, the requirement for a Secondary Plan is appropriate. No changes to Schedule 14 are warranted based on the proponent's comments.</p> <p>A recommendation has been included in the staff report to permit development applications on lands subject to Secondary Plans to proceed in advance of the completion of the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>2) The proponent recommends to be able to proceed with the site-specific application now that the height and densities in the site-specific application are consistent with those shown in the draft Official Plan. The Secondary Plan</p>	<p>1) See recommendation 1b) in the covering staff report.</p> <p>2) It is recommended that the City undertake the Primary Centre Secondary Plan study for Weston Road and Hwy. 7 as soon as possible after the approval of the Official Plan. Until the Official Plan is approved, all current policies and zoning will remain in effect.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>is a valuable coordination tool that is required to review the planning issues related the development of this area. Accordingly the Secondary Plan process should be maintained.</p> <p>The Proponent may continue to develop under the provisions of the current zoning by-law applicable to these lands.</p> <p>The City will undertake the study as soon as possible after the approval of the Official Plan. It is important that this Primary Centre develop as envisioned in the Official Plan.</p>	
<p>19B</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 27</p>	<p>1) Concerns with Schedule 2 and where three natural north-south watercourses and a 2.4 ha cultivated field within the Block 27 lands are identified as Core Features. Also, the Core Features on Schedules 2 and 13-1 do not appear to correspond with the descriptions set out in Policy 3.2.3.4.</p> <p>2) Policy 3.2.3.7- Reword policy to allow acceptable minor impacts on environmental facilities and ecosystem function.</p> <p>3) 3.3.1.3 - Is less restrictive than Policy</p>	<p>1) The Focus Rural Area Woodland Ecosystem Assessment identifies that forest stands 27-03, 27-04, 27-05 and 27-06 are all rated "Moderate" in the area in question. These woodlands are identified as Core Features on Schedule 2. As agreed with TRCA and York Region, all watercourses and drainage channels are recognized as Core Features.</p> <p>The 2.4 hectare open field connects the woodlands noted above and is identified as a "Recommended Enhancement Area" in Figure 7-1 of the Focus Rural</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) and 3) Core Features policies to be changed as follows. Policy 3.2.3.7 (c) to be changed as follows:</p> <p>That new development and/or site alteration in Core Features are prohibited except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. natural area management for the purposes of maintaining and enhancing the functions associated with Core Features; b. flood or erosion control projects, where such projects are necessary and

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>3.2.3.7. Request inconsistency be clarified and/or resolved.</p> <p>4) Policy 3.2.3.9 and 3.2.3.10 - Require details an basis used to identify Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>5) Policy 9.1.1.4 - Clarification is requested if City and Region have agreement to more frequent intersection spacing.</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.2.13 (b) - Clarification is requested if the intent of the policy is to include both New Community Areas in one Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>7) Policy 9.2.2.13(b)(vii) - A concern is raised that the requirement for an urban/rural transition zone could impose constraints on development along south side of Kirby which would be unwarranted if lands north side of Kirby are ultimately redesignated for urban purposes in the future.</p> <p>8) Policy 9.2.2.13(b)(xiii) and (xiv) - Requires 75% of phase to be built or under construction before subsequent phases may be registered. This could be onerous and adversely affect timing of development</p>	<p>Area Woodland Ecosystem Assessment report. The open field is identified as Enhancement Areas on Schedule 2 of Volume 1 of the City Official Plan.</p> <p>2) and 3) Changes to the policies regarding Core Features should be made to allow for minor modifications to the boundaries of Core Features while maintaining habitat area and enhancing overall ecosystem function.</p> <p>4) See Page 31 of the Natural Heritage in the City report for details of the criteria and types of features identified as Enhancement Areas. The Enhancement Area policies should be modified to recognize that development is permitted on all or part of Enhancement Area subject to the further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>5) There is no agreement between the City and the Region of York respecting more frequent intersection spacing.</p> <p>The finer detail of the road network will be determined through the Transportation Master Plan and at the Block Plan, Plan of Subdivision and Site</p>	<p>deemed in the public interest after all alternatives have been considered, and where such projects will not result in a negative impact on the Core Features and will not have a negative impact on the ecosystem function;</p> <p>c. transportation, infrastructure, and utilities, where such projects are necessary and deemed in the public interest after all alternatives have been considered, and where such projects will minimize negative impacts on the Core Features and measures shall be identified to maintain habitat area and enhance overall ecosystem function; and,</p> <p>d. low-intensity and passive recreational activities where such activities will not result in a negative impact on the Core Features and will not have a negative impact on the ecosystem function.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.3.8 to be changed as follows:</p> <p>Unauthorized removal or alteration of natural features or functions within areas identified as Core Features is prohibited, and will result in the features and functions being restored to their previous state at no expense to the City of Vaughan and other public agencies. In the case of a development</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>9) Policy 9.2.2.13(d) - it is questioned why sub-watershed study is required to be undertaken by TRCA as there is a concern that this could delay planning and development of the Block 27 lands.</p>	<p>Plan stages.</p> <p>6) It is the intent that the New Community Areas identified for Block 27 and 41 will require one Secondary Plan.</p> <p>7) This concern has been noted and the policy is recommended for deletion.</p> <p>8) Regarding Section 9.2.2.13 (b) (xiii) and (xiv)</p> <p>Section 9.2.2.13 (b) (xiii) and (xiv) included in the Official Plan requires that the 75% of a Phase of development be either built or under construction before a subsequent phase could be registered. This policy could be problematic considering that there can be a number of different conditions which determine whether it is appropriate to proceed to the subsequent phase of development, and not necessarily the specific degree of completion of the preceding phase.</p> <p>9) TRCA has consistently raised concerns that the Humber River Watershed Plan concluded that development in the watershed beyond areas designated for urban development in approved municipal official plans (pre 2005) could significantly increase</p>	<p>application, the application will not proceed until restoration works have been undertaken to the satisfaction of the City and TRCA and/or Region or York, as needed.</p> <p>A new policy will be added to the Core Features policies, as follows:</p> <p>That minor modifications to the boundaries and alignment of Core Features, as identified on Schedule 2, may be considered if environmental studies, submitted as part of the development process to the satisfaction of the City and in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, provide appropriate rationale for such minor modifications and include measures to maintain overall habitat area and enhance ecosystem function. Minor modifications deemed acceptable by the City and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority do not require amendment to this Plan. Core Features and their ecological buffers will be encouraged to be conveyed to the City and/or TRCA as a condition of development approval.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.1.3 regarding valley and stream corridors to be changed as</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>downstream flood flows and flood risk. As a result, an updated hydrologic study is required to properly plan for new development. This is required to confirm the level of stormwater control needed before expanding the urban boundaries in the Humber River watershed.</p>	<p>follows: That those public works considered to be generally compatible for location in the valleys are those associated with flood control, erosion control, reconstruction, repair or maintenance of existing drains approved under the Drainage Act. Public works which because of their linear nature, such as roadways, must cross the valleys at some point are permitted following completion of necessary environmental assessments. Where such structures are necessary, they must be properly sited, designed and constructed with state-of-the-art erosion and sediment control measures to minimize environmental impacts and measures shall be identified to maintain habitat area and enhance overall ecosystem function.</p> <p>4) The text describing Enhancement Areas on Page 55 of the Official Plan should be changed as follows:</p> <p>Enhancement Area opportunities have been identified consistent with the Region of York Official Plan policies to identify potential enhancement areas and linkages that complement the Regional Greenlands System. In</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, the potential Enhancement Areas reflect the best opportunities on remaining undeveloped land to provide additional habitat and/or ecological connectivity of the Natural Heritage Network through restoration or renaturalization of specific natural features.</p> <p>Enhancement Areas have been identified conceptually on Schedule 2. The request for and precise limits of Enhancement Areas to add to the Natural Heritage Network will be determined through appropriate studies to be initiated by the City or prepared as part of the development approvals process.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.3.9 to be changed to Policy 3.2.3.11, or appropriate number reference, as follows:</p> <p>That Enhancement Areas are identified conceptually on Schedule 2 and may be important potential components of the Natural Heritage Network because they may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) enhance form and function of watercourses; b) maintain and/or enhance water flow;

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>c) improve wildlife habitat value; d) improve species movement and/or dispersal; e) provide restoration options; f) improve overall connectivity value; and, g) improve the likelihood of maintaining self-sustaining vegetation.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.3.10 to be changed to Policy 3.2.3.12, or appropriate number reference, as follows:</p> <p>That development as provided for on Schedule 13 is permitted on all or part of Enhancement Areas subject to environmental studies conducted by the City or submitted as part of the development process, and prepared to the satisfaction of the City in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. The purpose of the studies will be to determine the function of the proposed Enhancement Area; to determine its supportability based on applicable science; and to establish the size and boundary of the Enhancement Area.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.3.11 to be changed to Policy 3.2.3.13, or appropriate number reference, as follows:</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Lands deemed appropriate as Enhancement Areas will be incorporated into the Natural Heritage Network as Core Features or suitable open space designations. Such changes do not require amendment to this Plan.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) A modification to Policy 9.2.2.13b) is recommended to read "New Community Areas are subject to one comprehensive and co-ordinated Secondary Plan process unless extenuating circumstances (eg. GTA West Corridor) would dictate otherwise..."</p> <p>7) Recommend policy 9.2.2.13 (b) (vii) be deleted.</p> <p>8) This policy should be modified to express that the Secondary Plan/Block Plan shall include phasing policies to ensure the orderly development of servicing and construction. (See new wording Section 9.2.2.13 (b) (xiii) and (xiv).</p> <p>Policy to be revised to remove reference to 75% of the phase (9.2.2.13.b (xiv) and 10.1.1.13)</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				9) No change is recommended.
21	<p>DATE: May 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 10610 Jane Street</p>	<p>General concerns have been raised respecting places of worship as follows:</p> <p>1) The recognition of existing uses in the Official Plan;</p> <p>2) Recognition of existing places of worship on roads with less than 26 metres in width;</p> <p>3) Ability to locate on streets with less than a 26 metre right-of-way;</p> <p>4) Places of worship to become legal non conforming;</p>	<p>Council on July 29, 2010, adopted the following resolution:</p> <p>“WHEREAS the City of Vaughan Draft Official Plan was presented to the public at an open house on May 3, 2010, and was the subject of a Public Hearing on May 17, 2010; and</p> <p>WHEREAS the City of Vaughan Council on June 8, 2010, adopted without amendment Item 3, Report No. 28, being the Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) report of June 1, 2010, Zoning By-law Amendment File: Z.10.015 – Places of Worship City of Vaughan, a</p>	<p>1) That Sections 9.2.1.9.e. and 10.2.2.1 (“Definitions”) be deleted from the Official Plan.</p> <p>2) Recommend that the following policy be inserted into Section: 9.2.1.9.e:</p> <p>“Policies existing prior to the adoption of this Plan shall remain in effect only as they apply to places of worship until such time as any new policies are approved.”</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) Places of worship being excluded from Agricultural designations;</p> <p>6) Creation of Institutional Zone;</p> <p>7) Maintain existing places of worship in an M1 Restricted Industrial Zone;</p> <p>8) Policies make it more difficult for the community to find a place where it can gather;</p> <p>9) Restrict the location of places of worship within private homes by the proposed definition is a violation of Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms section 2(a) as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada.</p>	<p>report to review current Zoning By-law 1-88 standards concerning places of worship and religious assembly with a view to examine whether the current zoning standards are appropriate and to advise Council on appropriate revisions as may be necessary;</p> <p>AND WHEREAS at the June 1, 2010, Public Hearing a number of important issues were raised respecting the proposed amendments to By-law 1-88, which will require more review and further public input and consideration;</p> <p>THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law provisions respecting Places of Worship be addressed in a future report to the Committee of the Whole in order to allow for a more extensive public consultation process, further research and more extensive evaluation of input received from the public will be undertaken and considered; and</p> <p>FURTHER, that current official plan policies and zoning provisions, respecting places of worship, remain applicable until such time as new City wide official plan policies are formulated and approved.”</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>In accordance with this resolution, Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law provisions for Places of Worship will be addressed in a future report to the Committee of the Whole.</p> <p>In consideration of the Council adopted resolution of June 29, 2010, calling for a more extensive public consultation process, further research and more extensive evaluation of public input; and that current official plan policies and zoning provisions, remain applicable until new City-wide official plan policies are approved.</p>	
<p>24B</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Beacon Environmental</p> <p>LOCATION: Bounded by Highway 27 to the east, the CN Rail to the west and other property owners to the north and</p>	<p>1) It is questioned why a past gravel pit is depicted as a water body.</p> <p>2) Issue with the "Enhancement Area" as identified in the Natural Heritage System which will constitute roughly 80% of the developable area of the Remington lands.</p> <p>3) Would like north-south, rather than east west linkages to be explored.</p>	<p>1) This area appears as a water body in the York Region Atlas, which is a valid data layer for analysis. If incorrect, then the change should be verified according to standard methods to maintain the York Region Atlas.</p> <p>2) The scientific and technical rationale for Enhancement Areas is questioned. The boundaries of the Enhancement Areas covering and in the vicinity of these properties are based on the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System "existing" and "potential" cover and the Regulated Area.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) Recommend that the Enhancement Area policies be modified as outlined in Item 19B.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	south. Block 59		<p>The Enhancement Area is intended to serve the purpose of identifying connectivity opportunities based on the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas policies will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>3) It is appropriate in the more detailed studies to evaluate and compare the benefits of north-south linkages rather than east-west linkages. This may be an option if environmental studies have evaluated connectivity options according to ecosystem function. Connectivity is not only for wildlife movement, but also for population dispersal (i.e. plant dispersal by small mammals and insects). Hence, connectivity can also be achieved through Open Space designations as well as Core Feature designations.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
24C	<p>DATE: June 01, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: The Remington Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: East Elder Mills, between Major Mackenzie Drive and Rutherford Road, and the CPR Line and Highway 7</p>	<p>Concerned with proposed Enhancement Area designation given to affecting subject property.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 24B.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 24B</p>
25	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Zelinka Priamo Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Fortino's at 3940 Highway 7; No Frills at 8585 Highway 27; Vacant lands fronting Highway 27 north of 8585 Highway 27(Part</p>	<p>1) Wish to see Minor Variance application A111/10 considered under current OP.</p> <p>2) Wish to see flexibility in wording of OP regarding transition from previous provisions to new OP policies.</p> <p>Wish to see flexible implementation and interpretation of policies in OP.</p> <p>3) Policy 2.2.4 Employment Areas and Schedule 1 vs. Schedule 13-P. The proponent seeks clarification for lands at 5731 Highway 7 whether the southern portion of the lands are proposed to be</p>	<p>1) Proponent has submitted a Site Development Application and a Minor Variance Application (File DA.02.065, File A111/10). Site Plan and Minor Variance and requests that these applications be considered under the current Official Plan policies.</p> <p>The current site plan application will be reviewed in the context of the existing zoning.</p> <p>2) Proponent is requesting recognition of existing development rights and would like a blanket statement that, "Existing uses approved prior to adoption of this</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) Recommend that following be added to Section 10.2:</p> <p>"To recognize legally existing land uses as they exist at the time this Plan is adopted. Such land uses shall be deemed to conform to this Plan. Minor Extensions or expansions of such uses shall be permitted without amendment to this Plan, provided that the intent of this Plan is not compromised and the tests prescribed below, are met:"</p> <p>a) the road pattern and transit routes</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>of Lot 11, Concession 8); No Frills at 5731 Highway 7; No Frills at 3800 Rutherford Road; Fortino's at 2911 Major Mackenzie Road; No Frills at 1631 Rutherford Road; No Frills at 1054 Centre St</p>	<p>designated Employment Area on Schedule 1.</p> <p>4) Section: 7.3.1.2 (d) Parks and Open Spaces, the proponent is not clear whether the lands required for public squares will be dedicated to the City or acquired through expropriation.</p> <p>5) Proponent is asking for flexibility in application of urban design policies as reflected in Section 9.3.1 of draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) Plan.</p> <p>6) Section 9.1.1.3, Proponent concerned about lack of flexibility of the pedestrian experience on public streets and right-of-way policies, the avoidance of blank facades along sidewalks may be difficult for retail commercial buildings due to internal operations.</p> <p>7) Concern about Section: 9.1.2.4, lack of flexibility for new developments in intensification areas to accommodate new development over short term.</p> <p>8) Concern about Section: 9.1.2.5, lack of flexibility for parking facilities in intensification areas, and concern about Section: 9.1.2.5.d as to where it is</p>	<p>plan shall be deemed to conform to this Plan. (references 9.2.1 of draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Plan).</p> <p>A policy is proposed to recognize existing uses.</p> <p>3) The entire lands at 5731 Highway 7 are designated "Mid Rise Mixed Use" on Schedule 13-P.</p> <p>4) Section 7.3.1.2 d. respecting public squares: public squares are designated though the development process and are eligible for parkland dedication. Parkland classified as Regional Parks, District Parks, Neighbourhood Parks and Public Squares are eligible for parkland dedication credits.</p> <p>5) The Official plan includes a policy (Section 9.2.1.2) which permits flexibility in the numerical values (except building height and FSI) to facilitate flexibility in building design requested subject to an Urban Design Brief being submitted to the satisfaction of the City</p> <p>6) In addition to the policies of Section: 9.1.1.3, which serve to improve the pedestrian experience, extensive Building Type and Development Criteria</p>	<p>envisioned by this Plan are not compromised or precluded in the long-term;</p> <p>b) the proposed expansion or enlargement of the existing use shall not unduly aggravate the situation created by the existence of the use, especially in regard to the requirements of the zoning by-law;</p> <p>c) the characteristics of the existing use and the extension or enlargement shall be examined with regard to noise, vibration, fumes, smoke, dust, odor, lighting, parking and traffic generation;</p> <p>d) the neighbouring uses will be protected where necessary by the provision of landscaping, buffering or screening devices, and measures to reduce nuisances and, where necessary, by regulations for alleviating adverse effects caused by lighting or advertising signs. Such provisions and regulations shall be applied to the proposed extension or enlargement and, where feasible, shall also be extended to the existing use in order to improve its compatibility with the surrounding area; and/or,</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>deemed appropriate.</p> <p>9) Concern about Section: 9.1.2.6, Loblaw lands at 5731 Highway 7 are partially designated Employment Uses in Schedule 1, and consequently whether the Employment Area policies apply.</p> <p>10) Concern about Section;9.1.3.2, Sustainable Development, as it relates to green roofs and does not provide for flexibility should a white roof be proposed.</p> <p>11) Concern that Section: 9.1.3.2 is unclear about whether Sustainable Development report will be required for site plan amendment application or for minor expansions to existing buildings.</p> <p>12) Concern about Section: 9.2.1.2 General Land Use Policies, specifically as it relates to minor variation from building type criteria.</p> <p>13) Concern about Section: 9.2.2.2, only a small scale retail use up to 1,220 sq m of retail would be permitted for the Loblaw lands at 8585 Highway 27 in a "Low Rise Mixed-Use" designation. Rendering the existing supermarket non-conforming.</p>	<p>in Section; 9.2.3 has also been incorporated into the Official Plan to ensure that there is an improved pedestrian experience. Development must meet the requirements of these policies.</p> <p>7) Over the short term existing zoning provisions will maintain current development opportunities.</p> <p>An overall objective within the draft Official Plan is to develop complete communities with compact urban form that supports transit service and promotes walking, cycling and healthy living and to identify a hierarchy of mixed-use centres to be developed in a compact form and at appropriate densities to support transit service. Interim uses are not being contemplated as they not meet the intent of the Plan.</p> <p>8) In Intensification Areas underground parking is preferred and as outlined in 9.1.2.5.e) surface parking areas are to be prohibited between the front face of a building and the public sidewalk.</p> <p>9) The subject lands are designated "Mid Rise Mixed-Use" on Schedule 13-P. The "Mid Rise Mixed -Use" policies are</p>	<p>e) in all cases where an existing use seriously affects the amenity of the surrounding area, consideration shall be given to the possibility of ameliorating such conditions, as a condition of approving an application for extension or enlargement of the existing use, especially where public health and welfare are directly affected."</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p> <p>12) No change is recommended.</p> <p>13) See recommendation number 2) above.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>14) Under Section 9.2.2.4.d), the existing retail uses on the Loblaw lands proposed to be Mid-Rise Mixed-Use will not conform with the 50% policies. It is not clear if minor expansion would be permitted unless accompanied by a no-retail development. It would appear that low rise uses, such as the existing retail food stores on the Loblaw lands would not be permitted under Section 9.5.2.5.e), and consequently non conforming. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>15) Section 10.1.1.1, The Loblaw lands at 3940 Highway 7 are proposed to be designated as part of Area 1 and the lands at 1631 Rutherford Road are proposed to be designated as part of Area 1 on schedule 14, and as such will require the completion of a secondary Plan. The timing of the secondary Plans is not known at this time. Not clear whether development can proceed prior to the preparation of secondary Plan.</p> <p>16) Section 10.1.1.2.n), As opposed to Section 9.2.3 sustainable development aspects are requirements to be addressed within Secondary Plans resulting in a general loss of flexibility.</p>	<p>applicable.</p> <p>10) Section 9.1.3.2 – The proposed Green Development Standards only establish initiatives that will be explored in the development of these standards.</p> <p>11) A Sustainable Development Report is recognized as part of a complete development application; the policies of 9.1.3.2 are encouraged, but not mandated. There should be a word change to Section 9.1.3.3 from “shall” to “encourage” respecting the provision of a Sustainable Development Report. It is not the intent of this policy to require sustainable development for minor expansions to existing buildings.</p> <p>12) Minor variation may occur through the review by Staff of the Urban Design Brief.</p> <p>13) Minor expansions to the existing building will be permitted in accordance with a proposed policy.</p> <p>14) A new policy is being proposed to recognize existing uses.</p> <p>15) The lands on Rutherford Road within Area 1 are subject to the policies of the</p>	<p>14) See recommendation number 2) above.</p> <p>15) No change is recommended.</p> <p>16) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Carville Centre Secondary Plan. The lands on Highway #7 within Area 4 on Schedule 14 will require the completion of a Secondary Plan for the Weston Road and Highway 7 area outlined on the schedule.</p> <p>An overall objective within the draft Official Plan is to develop complete communities with compact urban form that supports transit service and promotes walking, cycling and healthy living and to identify a hierarchy of mixed-use centres to be developed in a compact form and at appropriate densities to support transit service. Interim uses are not being contemplated as they not meet the intent of the Plan.</p> <p>16) The policy only requires that sustainable development requirements consistent with Section: 9.1.3 be addressed through the preparation of a Secondary Plan.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
26C	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MMM Group Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: South of Kirby Road, west of Huntington Road</p>	<p>MMM Group Limited on behalf of their client DiBattista Farms Ltd. has requested that their lands west of Huntington Road and South of Kirby Road in an area identified as the 'North of Nashville Precinct' be included in the current urban expansion.</p>	<p>The parcel west of Huntington Road, across from Area 2 in the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan, and east of the CP Rail tracks should be considered for residential development at some point in the future, in order to create a complete community as part of Area 2. The rail line acts as an effective boundary between residential and employment land uses. While it may be premature to designate this western parcel as part of an urban expansion at this time, consideration should be given to include a policy that would allow for an Official Plan amendment in the future. The appropriate land use would be determined based on a planning justification supported by technical studies and analysis.</p>	<p>A new Policy 2.2.3.7 should be added as follows:</p> <p>"That the lands fronting on Huntington Road, between the rail line to the west and the Huntington Road Community to the immediate east are recognized as an area for future residential development as an extension of the Huntington Road Community with the aim of establishing a more complete community. This extension will require an Official Plan amendment in the future."</p>
27	<p>DATE: June 10, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Naser Gjureci</p> <p>LOCATION: 15 Lansdowne Ave.</p>	<p>Wish to see further intensification of subject property- 8-10 storey's high, request further study into the matter.</p>	<p>The Official Plan designates this site Low-Rise Residential which permits development of townhouses as previously approved through site specific development applications on this property.</p> <p>The Hwy. 7 Land Use Review (OPA 661) which was recently approved did not permit higher density on these lands.</p> <p>Review through the new City OP</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>process finds that Low-Rise Residential development is appropriate at this location in the context of the abutting stable Low-Rise Residential to the north. No planning justification or analysis was submitted in support of the request.</p>	
<p>34</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Martha Bell</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter references a report by the Sustainable Urban Development Association in partnership with the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Ryerson University that found “a high degree of flexibility in what residents in the GTA would or could accept as their type of residence”. This suggests that there is much greater opportunity for suburban municipalities to accommodate new growth in a compact and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The letter also identifies that a majority of Vaughan’s housing stock is already in the form of ground related units.</p>	<p>The letter expressed opposition to the new community areas proposed by the Official Plan.</p> <p>The population projections to be accommodated by the City are mandated from the Province of Ontario, through the Regional Municipality of York. The Region of York has initiated Official Plan Amendment #2 to the Regional Official Plan for the purposes of approving the two new urban expansion areas in Vaughan. The City’s Official Plan must conform to the Regional Plan. The proposed urban expansion is the smallest in Vaughan’s history representing approximately 3% of the City’s total land area over a 20 year planning horizon.</p> <p>Through analysis conducted by Hemson Consulting and Urban Strategies Inc. it was concluded that approximately 85%</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>of the City's forecast housing demand to 2031 can be accommodated within the existing urban area. The remaining 15% could be met through a modest urban boundary expansion as a means to address the City's forecast long term land requirements, because:</p> <p>a. the identified intensification opportunities being reflected in the draft Official Plan will fully satisfy the Region's requirement of 45% of forecast future housing units within the Built Boundary, and will exceed the Growth Plan's policy directive of 40%;</p> <p>b. reliance upon intensification to address all of the City's forecast future housing needs is unrealistic given evidence of market preferences and demand for low density housing types;</p> <p>c. excessively restricting the availability of lands for lower density housing may result in inflated land and housing prices, creating affordability concerns as well as encouraging sprawl in other areas of the region less appropriate to accommodate it;</p> <p>d. minimal opportunity exists to achieve additional development within</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>designated Greenfield areas as planning approvals are already in place for nearly all such lands, and most are already in the process of development; and</p> <p>e. a modest amount of urban expansion will supplement the remaining supply of Greenfield area and provide for balance in the housing market.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan identifies Blocks 27 and 41 for residential community urban expansion and development, subject to completion of secondary plans which will be required to achieve the Regional minimum density requirements of 20 residential units per hectare and 70 residents and jobs per hectare, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan also establishes a comprehensive set of policies to create complete communities with a range of residential densities and a mix of land uses in keeping with Provincial and Regional initiatives. These policies require that a Secondary Plan and a Block Plan be prepared.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
35	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 7200 Yonge Street</p>	<p>1) The draft Official Plan proposes Mid-Rise Residential (H5, D1.5), High-Rise Mixed-Use (H18, D2.5) and Park which is generally supportive of designation but concerned about the extent of Parkland proposed.</p> <p>Policy 1.6 Structure and 1.7 How to Read this Plan: Volume 2 was only made available during the week of May 25th 2010, and did not allow sufficient opportunity to provide coordinated comments on the overall OP document in accordance with the City's schedule comments.</p> <p>2) Policy 2.1.3.2 j: Request "...through the establishment of green development standards to be achieved by new development to the extent practical."</p> <p>3) Policy 4.2.3.8: Should consider reduced parking standards in zoning by-laws in exchange for bicycle parking or bicycle sharing.</p> <p>4) Policy 4.3.2.2: Introduce a policy to implement reduced parking standards to recognize provision of bicycle parking, bicycle sharing, car pooling, car sharing and zero emission vehicle.</p>	<p>Staff met with the consultant KLM Planning and discussed the substantive issues and have taken the detailed comments under consideration.</p> <p>12) See Comments under Item 112.</p> <p>19) The proponents point is noted and a change to Mid-Rise Buildings Policy 9.2.3.5d) is recommended to increase the separation between primary window facades.</p>	<p>1) to 11) and 13) to 18) No change is recommended.</p> <p>Comments for draft Yonge/Steeles Secondary Plan will be dealt with as part of Volume 2.</p> <p>12) See Recommendation under Item 112.</p> <p>19) That Policy 9.2.3.5 be added to modify the second sentence. "Primary windows on a facade shall achieve a minimum windows separation from other primary windows facades of 30 metres".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) Policy 4.3.2.3: Clarify policy of cash in lieu of parking.</p> <p>6) Policy 7.1.1.3: Vaughan can promote a balanced supply but not ensure a balanced supply of housing provided. Request the word "shall have" with "will promote" which is consistent with Policy 7.5.1.1.</p> <p>7) Policy 7.3.1.2 e: Request parkland credit for Greenway that is 25m or greater, as Linear Parks are currently credited under OPA 600.</p> <p>8) Policy 7.3.3 Parkland Dedication and 7.3.3.7: Request all parkland must be acquired as provided for under the provisions of the Planning Act.</p> <p>9) Policy 7.3.3.2: Request that there is a maximum area which would be taken from any one owner based on parcel size. This approach is used in the City of Toronto (see section 3.2.3 of the City of Toronto OP) and needs to be investigated for use in Vaughan.</p> <p>10) Policy 7.5.1.3: Request section be removed as Vaughan cannot require all builders/developers to provide rental and special needs housing.</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>11) Policy 9.1.1.9.e: Request section be deleted as public art contribution associated with private development is unreasonable and not appropriate in OP policy.</p> <p>12) Policy 9.2.1.5 and 9.2.1.6: Request FSI figures be reviewed as OPA 600 there are areas currently designated Medium Density Residential/Commercial which are zoned to permit on street townhouses. Based upon typical standards street townhouses could have an FSI significantly greater than 1.5 FSI proposed in the new OP.</p> <p>13) Policy 9.2.2.1 & 9.2.2.2 & 9.2.2.5 & 9.2.2.6: Request clarification as built form policies are unclear. Do townhouse types include block townhouses as oppose to only street related townhouses.</p> <p>14) Policy 9.2.3: The level of detail not appropriate for an OP.</p> <p>15) Policy 9.2.3.2d Request clarification as section implies only street townhouses, and excludes block townhouses.</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>16) Policy 9.2.3.2.e: Request revision as 18m separation is far in excess of the zoning standards.</p> <p>17) 9.2.3.3.b: 50m is an arbitrary number.</p> <p>18) Policy 9.2.3.3.d Request revision as stacked townhouses are typically part of a block form development, with few of the units fronting onto public street.</p> <p>19) Policy 9.2.3.3.e Why does the facing distance have to be greater than that of mid-rise building which is 15m.</p>		
<p>36B</p>	<p>DATE: May 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Nonnodelsto Income Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Bathurst Street and Lady Dolores Avenue</p>	<p>Under OPA 638 the lands are designated "High Density Residential/Commercial" the draft Official Plan proposes a Mid-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p> <p>OPA 638 also permits an expanded range of commercial uses on the site and the owner wishes to maintain these permissions.</p>	<p>It is suggested that previous policy provisions in OPA 600 and OPA 638 allows the site to be developed as entirely retail, entirely residential, or a mixture of both. The proponent wishes to carry forward this flexibility into the new Official Plan.</p> <p>Policy 9.2.2.4 (d) regarding the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" will be modified to indicate that the requirement for mixed use is specific to intensification areas. The subject lands are not in an intensification area, hence, the modification to Policy 9.2.2.4 (d) will maintain the current permissions in OPA</p>	<p>That Section 9.2.2.4 (d) be amended to be specific to intensification areas.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			638 on the lands.	
42A	<p>DATE: May 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: The West Woodbridge Homeowners Association Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Pine Grove on Seven Properties Highway 7 and Kipling Ave</p>	Map correction on Schedule 13-Q not reflective of OMB decision for Pine Grove on Seven that form OPA 701 and maps are not to scale.	OPA # 701, as approved by the OMB is included as a site-specific amendment being retained in Volume 2.	See Schedule changes outlined in the Recommendation for Item 42C.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>42B</p>	<p>DATE: May 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ann Grech</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 7 and Kipling Ave</p>	<p>1) Concern is expressed that the OMB decision respecting the lands is not being reflected in the OP.</p> <p>2) Concern is expressed about the location of the boundary line between the "Low Rise Residential" designation along Coles Avenue and the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and "Low-Rise Mixed Use" designations fronting onto Highway #7.</p> <p>3) The letter states that the 3 corners at the intersection of Kipling Avenue & Hwy #7 (NE, NW, SE) should be capped at 4 storeys and a maximum FSI of 3.0.</p>	<p>1) OPA # 701, as approved by the OMB is included as a site-specific amendment being retained in Volume 2.</p> <p>2) This issue was identified in the May 17th, 2010 Public Hearing Report respecting Volume 1. Schedule 13-Q of the draft Official Plan incorrectly depicts this boundary. The boundary line will be adjusted to reflect the OMB decision.</p> <p>3) The OMB decision does not cap the maximum building height on the three corners of Kipling Avenue and Hwy #7 to 4 storeys. OPA #661 includes a policy that restricts the maximum building height to 4 storeys for development within 30 metres of a Low Density Residential designation. It is recommended that this policy be included in Volume 2 of the Official Plan. The Official Plan does include policies that would allow for appropriate transition to Low-Rise Residential Areas. However, given the OMB decision, the specific transition policies for this area will be reflected in Volume 2.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to adjust the boundary line separating the "Low Rise Residential" designation along Coles Avenue and the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and "Low-Rise Mixed Use" designations fronting onto Highway 7 to be consistent with the rear lot line of 62 & 68 Coles Avenue (extended eastward to the Pinegrove on 7 property – approximately 45.7 m in depth).</p> <p>3) That Section 12.2.11 of Volume 2 be amended to add a policy requiring that there shall be an appropriate height transition between intensification development to adjacent, sensitive land uses. For sites that abut a Low-Rise Residential designation, the maximum height of development within 30m of such designation shall be 4 storey, or 12.8 m, whichever is less.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>42C</p>	<p>DATE: May 13, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Drazen Bulat</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 7 and Kipling Ave</p>	<p>The letter identifies 10 specific issues:</p> <p>1) The OMB decision respecting OPA #661 provided for a maximum building height and FSI of 4 storeys and 1.5 respectively for the properties on the north side of Hwy # 7, west of Kipling Avenue, whereas Schedule 13Q to the Official Plan identifies a maximum building height and FSI of 5 storeys and 1.75 respectively.</p> <p>2) The OMB decision respecting OPA #661 provided for a maximum building height and FSI of 4 storeys and 1.5 respectively for the lands designated "Low Rise Mixed-Use" on the northeast corner of Kipling Avenue and Hwy #7, whereas Schedule 13Q depicts a building height of 5 storeys and a maximum FSI of 1.75.</p> <p>3) The OMB decision respecting OPA #661 excluded the properties fronting onto Landsdowne Avenue which are identified as "Low-Rise Mixed Use" on Schedule 13 Q of the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>4) The maximum FSI for the lands located on the northeast corner of Kipling Avenue and Hwy #7 is shown as 5.0 whereas the correct figure should be</p>	<p>1) This statement is correct with respect to the maximum building height of 4 storeys, which is included in policy 8.3 f) 2 vi) of OPA #661. However, with respect to the FSI, the lands on the north side of Hwy 7 fall within the Transit Stop Centre (defined as within 200m of a transit stop) which would permit a maximum FSI density of 3.0. The FSI of 1.75 shown on Schedule 13-Q is lower than 3.0 FSI that would have been permitted under OPA #661.</p> <p>2) The OMB decision respecting OPA #661 does not change the maximum building height or FSI on the northeast corner of Kipling Avenue and Hwy 7. However, OPA #661 includes a policy that the maximum building height shall be 4 storeys within 30 m of a Low Density Residential designation, which would effectively result in a majority of the corner property being four storeys in height. The Official Plan does include policies that would allow for appropriate transition to Low-Rise Residential Areas. However, given the OMB decision, the specific transition policies for this area will be reflected in Volume 2.</p> <p>3) This statement is correct. However, this property is designated "Low-Rise</p>	<p>1) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to show a maximum building height of 4 storeys for the lands located on the north side of Hwy #7, west of Kipling Avenue;</p> <p>AND That no further action be taken with respect to the permitted FSI.</p> <p>2) That Section 12.2.11 of Volume 2 be amended to add a policy requiring that there shall be an appropriate height transition between intensification development to adjacent, sensitive land uses. For sites that abut a Low-Rise Residential designation, the maximum height of development within 30m of such designation shall be 4 storey, or 12.8 m, whichever is less.</p> <p>AND That no further action be taken with respect to the FSI.</p> <p>3) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to show a maximum building height of 3 storeys for the property located at the northwest corner of Hwy #7 and Landsdowne Avenue.</p> <p>4) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to show a maximum FSI of 3.0 for the lands located at the northeast corner of</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>3.0 in accordance with previously approved OPA #661.</p> <p>5) The maximum FSI for the lands located on the southeast corner of Kipling Avenue and Hwy #7 is shown as 5.0 whereas the correct figure should be 3.0 in accordance with previously approved OPA #661. This is correct and will be revised on Schedule 13Q.</p> <p>6) The letter requests that Schedule 13-Q does not reflect the OMB decision which permits a maximum 4 storey building height within 30 m of a Low-Density residential designation for the Pinegrove lands at the southwest corner of Kipling Avenue and Hwy #7.</p> <p>7) Concern is expressed about the location of the boundary line between the "Low Rise Residential" designation along Coles Avenue and the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and "Low-Rise Mixed Use" designations fronting onto Highway 7.</p> <p>8) The letter states that OPA #661 provides for a maximum building height of 4 storeys within 30 metres of a "Low Density" residential designation and the draft OPA does not implement this transition policy. The letter requests that</p>	<p>Mixed-Use" to reflect the existing Health Centre on the property and therefore a "Low Rise Residential" designation would not be appropriate. However, the maximum building height permitted of 5 storeys as shown on Schedule 13Q should be reduced to 3 storeys.</p> <p>4) The respondent is correct in this respect and Schedule 13Q will be amended to reflect the proper FSI.</p> <p>5) OPA #661 provides for a maximum building height of 4 storeys within 30 metres of a "Low Density" residential designation and the draft OPA does not implement this transition policy. The letter requests that the equivalent 30m buffer zone be designated "Low- Rise Residential" with a maximum building height of 4 storeys and a maximum FSI of 1.5. A site-specific policy will be included in Volume 2 of the Official Plan to reflect this requirement. With respect to the maximum FSI, the respondent is correct and Schedule 13-Q will be amended. The Official Plan does include policies that would allow for appropriate transition to Low-Rise Residential Areas. However, given the OMB decision, the specific transition policies for this area will be reflected in Volume 2.</p>	<p>Kipling Avenue & Hwy #7.</p> <p>5) That Section 12.2.11 of Volume 2 be amended to add a policy requiring that there shall be an appropriate height transition between intensification developments to adjacent, sensitive land uses. For sites that abut a Low-Rise Residential designation, the maximum height of development within 30m of such designation shall be 4 storey, or 12.8 m, whichever is less.</p> <p>That Schedule 13-Q be amended to show a maximum FSI of 3.0 for the lands located at the southeast corner of Kipling Avenue & Hwy #7.</p> <p>6) No further action be taken.</p> <p>7) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to adjust the boundary line separating the "Low Rise Residential" designation along Coles Avenue and the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and "Low-Rise Mixed Use" designations fronting onto Highway 7" to be consistent with the rear lot line of 62 & 68 Coles Avenue (extended eastward to the Pinegrove on 7 property – approximately 45.7 m in depth).</p> <p>8) That Section 12.2.11 of Volume 2 be</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>the equivalent 30m buffer zone be designated "Low- Rise Residential" with a maximum building height of 4 storeys and a maximum FSI of 1.5.</p> <p>9) The letter states that OPA #661 provides for a maximum building height of 4 storeys and a FSI of 1.5 within 30 metres of a "Low Density" residential designation. The letter requests that Schedule 13-Q be amended to lower the maximum building height from 5 storeys to 4 storeys and the FSI from 1.75 to 1.5 on the lands designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" on the south side of Highway #7, west of Kipling Avenue.</p> <p>10) 7374, 7412, 7440 and 7476 Kipling Avenue have been designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" with a maximum building height of 4 storeys and an FSI of 1.5. The letter requests that these lands be designated "Low-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>6) OPA #701, as approved by the OMB is included in as a site specific amendment being retained in Volume 2.</p> <p>7) This issue was identified in the May 17th, 2010 Public Hearing Report respecting Volume 1. Schedule 13Q of the draft Official Plan incorrectly depicts the boundary. The boundary line will be adjusted in the next version as identified in the Recommendation.</p> <p>8) It is recommended that the policy respecting the 4 storey maximum building height within 30 m of a residential designation be incorporated into Volume 2. However, under OPA #661 would permit a maximum FSI of 3.0 on these lands. The Official Plan does include policies that would allow for appropriate transition to Low-Rise Residential Areas. However, given the OMB decision, the specific transition policies for this area will be reflected in Volume 2.</p> <p>9) It is recommended that the policy respecting the 4 storey maximum building height within 30 m of a residential designation be incorporated into Volume 2. However, under OPA</p>	<p>amended to add a policy requiring that there shall be an appropriate height transition between intensification development to adjacent, sensitive land uses. For sites that abut a Low-Rise Residential designation, the maximum height of development within 30m of such designation shall be 4 storey, or 12.8 m, whichever is less.</p> <p>AND That no further action be taken with respect to the FSI.</p> <p>9) The letter states that OPA #661 provides for a maximum building height of 4 storeys and a FSI of 1.5 within 30 metres of a "Low Density" residential designation. The letter requests that Schedule 13-Q be amended to lower the maximum building height from 5 storeys to 4 storeys and the FSI from 1.75 to 1.5 on the lands designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" on the south side of Highway #7, west of Kipling Avenue.</p> <p>AND that no further action be taken with respect to the FSI.</p> <p>10) That Schedule 13-Q be amended to redesignate 7374, 7412, 7440 and 7476 Kipling Avenue from "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" to "Low-Rise Residential".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>#661 would permit a maximum FSI of 3.0 on these lands.</p> <p>10) These lands are located at the bottom of Kipling Avenue which is a dead end street.</p>	
43	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: IBI Group</p> <p>LOCATION: 1890 and 1870 Highway 7 West</p>	<p>The letter outlines 6 specific request as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new Official Plan does not properly reflect the development limits of the property. 2. The Barrie GO line is shown as a "Proposed GO Transit Network" when it is an existing GO transit network. 3. Schedule 13-S should be amended to show a minimum 3.5 FSI on the lands in accordance with OPA #660. 4. Include a policy in the Official Plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Concord Floral site is currently an active file. The applicants question the Core Features designation of the Ontario Realty Corporation lands above the top of bank of the valleyland. The extent of the Natural Heritage Network beyond the valleyland will be determined through the development review process. 2. There is no existing GO Station at this location. The "Proposed GO Station" designation is consistent with Map 11 of the Region of York Official Plan. 3. The lands are subject to a future Secondary Plan Study as shown on 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No change recommended. 2) No change recommended. 3) No change recommended. 4) No change recommended. 5) No change recommended. 6) See Recommendation in 1b) in the Staff Report

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>that would allow retail uses to exceed 50% of the gross floor area for the lands, subject to a Secondary Plan Study.</p> <p>5. Allow more flexibility in the design standards set out in Chapter 9.2.3.</p> <p>6. Include a policy to allow for separate secondary plans to be undertaken for the areas north and south of Hwy #7.</p>	<p>Schedule 14. All lands subject to a Secondary Plan Study within the Official Plan are being shown without height and density figures subject to the completion of the study. In addition the lands are subject to current Official Plan and Zoning Amendment Applications, through which a specific density could be assigned as determined appropriate.</p> <p>4. The subject lands are located on a Primary Intensification Corridor where it is not the intention to permit sites with greater than 50% retail uses. If through a Secondary Plan Study it is determined that this is appropriate, the Official Plan can be amended at that time to reflect the outcome of the study. Such a policy is not required in Volume 1.</p> <p>5. The Official plan includes a policy (Section 9.2.1.2) which permits flexibility in the numerical values (except building height and FSI) to facilitate flexibility in building design requested subject to an Urban Design Brief being submitted to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>6. The lands are identified as being subject to a Secondary Plan review under Schedule 14. The owner has requested that a separate Secondary</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			Plan be permitted for the lands located north and south of Highway 7.	
45	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northeast corner of Jane St & Riverrock Gate (south of Rutherford Road)</p>	Opposed to the Commercial Mixed-Use designation proposed in the new Official Plan. Recently OPA 653 was adopted and removed the subject lands from OPA 450 (Employment Lands) and placed in OPA 600 (Vaughan Centre Secondary Plan). Lands were recently redesignated from "Prestige Area" to "High Density Residential/Commercial".	In September 2006 Council approved OPA #653 to redesignate the lands "High Density Residential / Commercial". The Amendment was approved by Vaughan Council but not supported by the Region of York. An Ontario Municipal Board Hearing was held where the disposition of OPA #653 was stayed by the OMB. Accordingly, it is recommended that no change be made to the Official Plan. The request to redesignate the land to "High Density Residential-Commercial" would represent an employment conversion which is not supported by the policies of the proposed Official Plan or Regional Official Plan.	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
47	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Public and Catholic School Boards (English and French)</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) Policy 7.2.3.1- The Region of York Catholic School Board asserts that wording in this policy is not consistent with procedures used in determining location, number and size of schools. Suggest the following addition to the paragraph "the precise location, size and number of schools shall be established by the City in consultation with the appropriate English and French Public and Catholic school boards consistent with the policies of each board".</p> <p>2) Policy 7.2.3.2- The Board recommends the inclusion of policies that take advantage of Section 37 of the Planning Act in enabling schools to obtain unspecified community benefits to offset the fiscal barriers associated with higher density school facilities.</p> <p>3) Policy 9.1.3- Policies for Green Development Standards should have language such as "encourage" and "subject to available funding" be applied to these initiatives with respect to school boards.</p> <p>4) Policy 9.2.1.9- Suggest an exception be made to permit day cares in all schools.</p>	<p>1) The current procedure during the planning process is for schools to determine the number and size of schools needed is determined by the City in consultation with the School Board. Their location based on school board policies to meet community needs while promoting walkable and safe schools. Municipalities are generally expected to accommodate these needs.</p> <p>2) A bonusing policy for increases in height or density is provided for in the Official Plan that applies in the VMC, Primary Centres, or when specified in a Secondary Plan. However, it is defined as a means by which the City may permit additional height and density in return for community benefits. The school board is seeking benefits from the City to defray the costs of higher density schools in consideration of their fiscal constraints.</p> <p>3) The current mandatory wording of Policy 9.1.3 may pose onerous fiscal burdens on school boards.</p> <p>4) A change is recommended to Policy 9.2.1.9 to permit day care facilities in school.</p> <p>5) In order to manage traffic efficiently</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No changes are recommended pending further discussion with the school board on how this could be implemented.</p> <p>3) A wording change to Policy 9.1.3.3 is recommended from "shall" to "are encouraged to".</p> <p>4) The permission to include day care facilities within schools is recommended.</p> <p>5) Greater flexibility in the wording of Policy 9.2.3.9 is recommended from "not permitted" to "discouraged" in order to accommodate school board policies designed to ensure safety and comfort. Further work will be needed in consultation with the school boards to develop site planning models that can accommodate the needs of the City and school boards.</p> <p>6) Change wording in Policy 9.2.3.8(d) from "shall" to "may" is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) Policy 9.2.3.8 (b), (c)- Concerns with no parking at front or side of building and the street provisions as it would negatively impact traffic management on a school site.</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.3.8 (d)- Suggest policy change from "shall include" to "are encouraged to include" greenspace, outdoor amenity space or environmental features such as solar panels on rooftop on all public institutional buildings.</p>	<p>school sites must include parking and drop off areas near main entrances.</p> <p>6) In view of fiscal constraints imposed on school boards, Policy 9.2.3.8 could be relaxed.</p>	
<p>48F</p>	<p>DATE: July 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan 400 North Employment Area</p>	<p>Request confirmation that the recommendations of the report do not apply to lands subject to ROPA 52 and OPA 637. Landowners object to any proposed change in commercial land use policy which departs from OPA 450 or OPA 600 for the Vaughan 400 Employment Area.</p>	<p>1) OPA #637 has been included in Volume 2 as an area specific amendment and therefore all of the policies in OPA #637 will remain in effect. Where OPA #637 is silent on policies included in Volume 1, those policies will apply to the OPA #637 Amendment area.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>49B</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1152 Centre Street</p>	<p>The letter makes several requests including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Owner supports the “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use” designation on the lands shown on the Volume 1 mapping. 2. The term “other active uses” in Section 9.2.2.4 is not defined. 3. Clarification is requested with respect to whether the permitted building types included with 70 m of lands designated “Low Rise Residential” also includes the permitted building types for the main land use designation, subject to the performance standards in Section 9.2.3. 4. The respondent has raised concerns with respect to the approach used in Section 9.2.3 respecting built form. 5. Requested that OPA #672 not be included in Volume 2, since it would prevail over Volume 1 and therefore the Plan would not be in conformity with the Regional Official Plan and Provincial policies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) and 5) Volume 2 policies of the Centre Street OPA 672 should apply to these lands for the purposes of this planning process. A further study of the OPA 672 area should be undertaken in future. 2) The term “other active uses” in Section 9.2.2.4 is not defined. It is recommended that the term remain in order to allow flexibility in the range of uses permitted. In the context of the “Mixed-Use Mid-Rise designation” the uses are interpreted to include, but not limited to, restaurants, retail stores, commercial uses, and cafes etc., that are appropriate on arterial streets and create pedestrian friendly experiences. Large format retail would be discouraged. 3) The permitted building types included with 70 m of lands designated “Low Rise Residential” also includes the permitted building types for the main land use designation, subject to the proposed development satisfying all of the transition policies in the Official Plan. 4) The Official Plan includes a policy (Section 9.2.1.2) which permits flexibility in the numerical values (except building height and FSI) to facilitate flexibility in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No change is recommended. 2) No change is recommended. 3) No change is recommended. 4) No change is recommended. 5) No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>design required subject to an Urban Design Brief being submitted to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	
<p>50C</p>	<p>DATE: May 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1500 Centre Street</p>	<p>1) Support the Mid-Rise Mixed-Use designation in Volume 1 as opposed to the designation under Volume 2, which would prevail.</p> <p>2) Policy 10.1.1.4 - Requirements for Secondary Plan will delay redevelopment and intensification and request City to initiate Secondary Plan. Also request provision be added to allow existing permissions in OPA 672 to continue pending adoption of Secondary Plan.</p> <p>3) Identifies several issues that should be examined in Secondary Plan Study (see letter dated May 27, 2010).</p>	<p>1) The Secondary Plan for this area was undertaken through extensive community consultation. Any changes to the plan should only proceed by way of a review.</p> <p>2) The applicants concern is noted. A Secondary Plan will be undertaken as soon as possible.</p> <p>3) A Terms of Reference will be prepared for any Secondary Plan Study prepared by the City which will establish the full range of issues to be reviewed.</p> <p>4) Proponent states that Policies 9.2.1.2 and 9.2.3.5 are too specific.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) Policy 9.2.1.2 and 9.2.3.5 - Built form policies are too specific for an OP and should take form as guidelines.</p> <p>5) Support Policy 4.3.2.2 that allows reduced site-specific parking requirements and recognize need to reduce parking and encourage transit ridership.</p> <p>6) Attached preliminary architectural drawings that can be considered appropriate for subject property.</p>	<p>Section 9.2.1.2 permits some flexibility to the effect that minor variations will be permitted to the built form policies, provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the city. This policy refers to flexibility with respect to built form criteria outlined in 9.2.3.</p> <p>5) Transit supportive policies are included throughout the Official Plan and the City is currently undertaking a City-wide parking standards review to re-examine and establish new policy standards that respond to the City's planned urban structure.</p> <p>6) Specific development proposals are not being considered through the Official Plan review. but this information will be helpful when undertaking the aforementioned study.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
51B	<p>DATE: May 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1260, 1272, 1282, 1294, 1304 and 1314 Centre Street</p>	<p>1) Support the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation in Volume 1 rather than the policies in Volume 2.</p> <p>2) Request consideration of a maximum building height change from 6 to 8 storeys.</p> <p>3) Regional Corridors overall density target is 2.5 FSI but proposed density block is 2.0. Request that a maximum density of 2.5 FSI be available for larger land holdings such as the subject lands because of the additional site planning flexibility that be available.</p> <p>4) Policy 9.2.1.2 and 9.2.3.5 built form policies should be guidelines not absolute requirements.</p> <p>5) Support Policy 4.3.2.2 that allows reduced site-specific parking requirements and recognize need to reduce parking and encourage transit ridership.</p>	<p>1) The Secondary Plan for this area was undertaken through extensive community consultation. Any changes to the plan should only proceed by way of a review.</p> <p>2) The applicants concern is noted. A Secondary Plan will be undertaken as soon as possible.</p> <p>3) A Terms of Reference will be prepared for any Secondary Plan Study prepared by the City which will establish the full range of issues to be reviewed.</p> <p>4) Policy 9.2.1.2 provides minor variations to built form policies, provided they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>5) The Parking standards to implement the OP will be detailed through the city-wide Parking Standards Review.</p>	<p>1,2 and 3) Volume 2 policies of the Centre Street OPA 672 should apply to these lands for the purposes of this planning process. A further study of the OPA 672 area should be undertaken in the future. No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
51C	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1260, 1272, 1282, 1294, 1304 and 1314 Centre Street</p>	<p>Request that comments are considered in preparation of OP. Wish to see permissions consistent with Regional OP, as Volume 2 of Draft OP contains provisions from OPA 672, which are not as favourable to subject property as Volume 1, indicated in Schedule 13-T.</p>	<p>Proponent is requesting that maximum FSI of at least 2.0 times the area of the lot, be available for larger land holdings as the proponent's lands have greater depths/lot areas and therefore more site planning flexibility.</p> <p>A portion of lands are subject to OMB decision permitting a 32 bedroom senior citizen residence; remaining lands are subject to policies of Volume 2, Centre Street Secondary Plan (OPA 672).</p> <p>Policies of OPA 672 should be reviewed in a future study given the new planning framework for the City and the more recent Regional Policies respecting Rapid Transit Corridors.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the current VOP planning process the policies of the existing OMB decision and Volume 2, OPA 672 will apply to the lands. A further study of the OPA 672 area should be undertaken in future as soon as possible.</p>
53	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: North of Steeles Ave & east of Jane St</p>	<p>UPS is concerned about the Primary Centre designation in Schedule 1 that includes mixed uses. Schedule 13 designates the lands "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" is unrealistic and unacceptable to UPS.</p> <p>Concerned about the absence of policies that deal with land use compatibility between industrial and residential uses.</p>	<p>The land use designations shown on Schedule "13-S" to the new Official Plan reflect the long-term plan for the Steeles Corridor, from Jane to Keele Streets, as established in OPA 620, which was approved by the OMB on August 20, 2008. The OPA 620 lands are recognized on Schedule 14 to the new plan as the "Steeles West" Secondary Plan Area, which policies will be incorporated into Section 11 of Volume 2 of the plan. These plans reflect earlier development permissions. Where the</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>policies of Volume 1 conflict with the policies of Volume 2, the Volume 2 policies shall prevail. As such, the protection to accommodate the UPS lands as set out in OPA 620 are maintained in the plan. The OPA 620 policies provide that previously approved and existing uses like UPS are permitted (3.2.3.2. b) and are deemed to conform to OPA 620 (7.2 a) and it requires that new, particularly sensitive land uses, proposing to locate in proximity to existing uses, demonstrate compatibility and where necessary, mitigate the impact of existing uses.</p>	
<p>54</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Velta Mussellam</p> <p>LOCATION: 7934, 7946, 7994, 8000 Yonge Street and 39 Mill Street</p>	<p>1) The "Natural Areas" and "Countryside" designations in Schedule 1 are not consistent with York Region Official Plan as only the valleyland portion of TGCC are identified as part of Regional Greenland System.</p> <p>2) Request that tablelands in the eastern extremity of the TGCC property be included in the "Community Areas", which may be appropriate for the future extension of single family housing.</p> <p>3) Yonge Street frontage of the TGCC includes 7 acres of land designated as part of Thornhill Yonge Street Local</p>	<p>1) The Regional Greenlands System includes only valleylands in the vicinity of the Thornhill Golf and Country Club. Figure 3 of Natural Heritage in the City report shows only valleylands as Core Features.</p> <p>2) The Core Features are within the Greenbelt boundary. The tableland portion is currently shown as Private Open Space on Schedule 1. Staff has reviewed the request and can support designating the tableland portion of the lands as "Community Area" on Schedule 1.</p>	<p>1) Recommend Schedule 1 and 2 be amended to illustrate the valleylands and appropriate 10 m buffer as Core Features.</p> <p>2) That Schedules 1 illustrate the remainder of the Thornhill Golf and Country Club and Private Open Space or Community Area, as appropriate.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended for Volume 1.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Centre, provides an ideal locations for the development densities prescribed by the York Region Official Plan. Further study should be given to this area.</p>	<p>3) This request will be reviewed through the Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan which forms Volume 2 of the Official Plan.</p>	
<p>55</p>	<p>DATE: May 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MHBC Planning</p> <p>LOCATION: 140 Northview Boulevard and Northwest corner of Highway 400 and Major Mackenzie Drive</p>	<p>The letter establishes 7 requests as follows:</p> <p>1) That the property be designated "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" similar to the Wal-Mart property to the west given the similar nature of the land uses.</p> <p>2) That a legal-non conforming clause be inserted into the Official Plan to recognize existing uses.</p> <p>3) That a policy be included in the Official Plan to allow minor development of lands prior to the completion of a Secondary Plan for lands shown on Schedule 14.</p> <p>4) A provision is included in the Official Plan requiring that new projects in intensification areas be required to mitigate potential noise impacts from existing uses.</p>	<p>1) The redesignation of the lands as requested would represent an employment lands conversion which is not supported at this time. In addition, the request is not supported by a planning justification report or other appropriate study.</p> <p>2) The lands at Hwy #400 & Major Mackenzie Drive remain undeveloped at this time and therefore, there are no existing uses on the lands. However, these lands are also zoned by By-law 1-88 (Exception 9(1221)) which will facilitate the development of the lands with existing approvals. The lands at 140 Northview Boulevard are developed and zoned by By-law 1-88. It is not proposed to recognize zoning approvals in the Official Plan.</p> <p>3) The existing zoning will facilitate development of the lands.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) Adding the following policy to Section 5.2.1</p> <p>"To protect Vaughan's manufacturing, industrial and warehousing sectors from potential impacts, any development or redevelopment of lands for sensitive land uses located within 500 metres of an Employment Area, may be required to undertake appropriate environmental studies (e.g., noise, dust, vibration etc.), to be identified on a case by case basis, in order to ensure land use compatibility with the surrounding Employment Area lands. As a result of the studies, on-site or off-site mitigation measures may be required prior to development of the</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) That the properties be designated "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and permit "Major Retail" and "Retail Warehouse" to occupy 100% of the gross floor area on the site.</p> <p>6) The "Employment Area" and "Primary Intensification Corridor" designations are removed from the property.</p> <p>7) The "Natural Area" designation be removed from the site.</p>	<p>4) Staff has recommended such a policy be included in Section 5.2.1 that would require that new adjacent land uses to prepare the appropriate environmental or noise reports to ensure the proposed use does not destabilize the industrial use.</p> <p>5.) As noted above, both sites are zoned by By-law 1-88 with, which would maintain all existing approvals on the subject lands. It is not proposed that these approvals be reflected in the Official Plan.</p> <p>6) It is not appropriate to remove this designation from one property of a proposed corridor designation as it will result in piece-meal planning affecting the city's ability to achieve the desired long-term goals for the corridor.</p> <p>7) To be consistent with the Natural Heritage Network on Schedule 2, the "Natural Area" designation will be removed from the lands. A drainage feature is identified as a Core Feature in parcels at the northeast corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Hwy 400.</p>	<p>sensitive land use."</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) That Schedule 13-I BE AMENDED to delete the "Natural Area" designation from the lands.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
56	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Lormel Homes</p> <p>LOCATION: 3660 Rutherford Road</p>	<p>Request "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation be changed to "Mid-Rise Residential" (or similar) to permit a residential condo building without a commercial component.</p> <p>A request is also made to increase the maximum building height to 10 storeys and increase permitted FSI to 2.5.</p>	<p>The Official Plan designates this site "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use", with a maximum height of 6 storeys and maximum density of 2.0 FSI.</p> <p>The Rutherford Road frontage is characterized by Mid-Rise Mixed-Use and Commercial Mixed-Use. Within this designation slightly higher densities are specified in close proximity to the Rutherford Rd. and Jane St. intersection. The subject lands are located farther away from this intersection. The lands are located in a primary commercial land use context along Rutherford Road. Therefore, the Mixed-Use designation is appropriate.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
58B	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 130 Racco Parkway</p>	<p>Owners of the Pavilion recreational facility proposed an intensification site to facilitate, partial redevelopment for two apartment buildings containing approximately 400 units.</p> <p>1) Requests the proposed "Natural Area" designation be removed from the lands.</p> <p>2) The draft OP purposes to redesignate the property to "Commercial Mixed-Use" and would significantly narrow the range of commercial uses being allowed. Not</p>	<p>1) A possible drainage feature is depicted in an existing developed area.</p> <p>2 and 3) The lands are identified Employment Area under the Urban Structure Plan of the Official Plan, and designated "Commercial Mixed-Use" on the Land Use Schedule with a maximum height of 4 storeys and maximum density of 1.5 FSI.</p> <p>Existing uses are permitted as legal non-compliant.</p>	<p>1) The natural feature through the developed sites should be removed from mapping.</p> <p>2) and 3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>even existing use would be permitted. Request to permit residential uses as part of mixed-use.</p> <p>3) Remove the lands from the "Employment Area" designation in Urban Structure Plan (Schedule 1).</p>	<p>These lands are located in a small pocket of Prestige Employment, framed by Hwy. 407, Dufferin Street, and the Parkway Belt utility corridor.</p> <p>Residential uses are not considered appropriate within the context of the surrounding lands.</p>	
60B	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Brutto Consulting</p> <p>LOCATION: Northeast corner of Keele St. and Kirby Road</p>	<p>Request for the inclusion of a 6 acre portion (White Belt lands) of subject land be included in the Expansion Area.</p>	<p>This requested urban expansion does not conform to the Region of York Official Plan and is not supported by any of the analysis undertaken by the City as part of the Official Plan review. In addition, the owner has not submitted any studies to support the request.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
61	<p>DATE: April 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Fogler, Rubinoff LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Regional Road 27 & Milani Boulevard</p>	<p>The OP does not recognize the subject lands as retail commercial development. The entire lands should be designated with the appropriate commercial designation.</p>	<p>The subject lands to the east are currently designated "General Commercial" as per OPA N0. 451 which permits all General Commercial Uses, as well as, retail warehousing, supermarket, L.C.B.O., beer store , clinic. These lands are zoned C2 General Commercial Zone.</p> <p>The lands to the west subject to By-law 41-2010, (Phase III) were approved by the OMB and rezoned to EM3 Retail Warehouse Employment Zone and is to be developed with retail warehouse type uses.</p> <p>Phase II is in the process of going forward to Council for additional retail warehouse type use.</p> <p>As these lands are recently developed with a number of commercial/ retail warehouse uses and with some vacant lands that are proposed to be developed with additional retail warehouse type uses it is considered appropriate to designate the lands "Commercial Mixed-Use" with an exception to recognize site-specific-uses.</p>	<p>Amending Schedule 13-L by deleting the "Prestige Employment" and "General Employment" designations on the subject lands and designating the lands "Commercial Mixed-Use".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
62	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Lormel Homes</p> <p>LOCATION: Southeast corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard</p>	<p>The letter requests an extension of the commercial block south to abut the Smart Centres site and amend the land use designation to "Mid-Rise Residential" (or similar) to permit an 8-10 storey residential condo building with an approx. FSI of 2.7</p>	<p>Extending the commercial block south to the north limit of the Smart Centres site is considered appropriate since it would eliminate a small Low-Rise Residential designation located between lands designated "Low-Rise Residential" and "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use". However, the density should not exceed those prescribed for the NE corner of Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive being a maximum of 6 storeys and 2.0 FSI.</p>	<p>THAT Schedule 13 and Schedule 13-I BE AMENDED to redesignate Block 272 on Plan 65M-3898 from "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" and "Low Rise Residential" to "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" with a maximum building height of 6 storeys and FSI of 2.0.</p>
63B	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>LOCATION: Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent</p>	<p>This letter raises a number of issues as follows:</p> <p>1) It is unclear what the reference to "low scale" buildings refers to in Section 9.2.2.9 a).</p> <p>2) Add the following to Section 9.2.2.9 a: "Areas designated as General Employment will accommodate vehicles and truck for freight handling including the pick-up, delivery and transitory storage of raw materials and good incidental to motor freight shipment directly related to the General Employment use."</p> <p>3) As written, Section 9.2.2.9 b) would permit schools in General Employment lands.</p>	<p>1) The permitted building types and built form policies are included in Sections 9.2.2 and 9.2.3 to provide interpretation to the term "low scale".</p> <p>2) The policy in Section 9.2.2.9 a) as written is sufficient to provide policy direction at an Official Plan level and interpreted to include the uses identified in the requested amendment. Specific uses are detailed in the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>3) This interpretation is correct and Section 9.2.2.9 should be corrected to delete "schools" as a permitted use in an Employment Area.</p> <p>4) It is not intended to create "split" land use designations. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy in OPA</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) Policy 9.2.2.9 should be amended by deleting the word "schools".</p> <p>4) That the following policy be added to Section 10.2, "Interpretation" as follows:</p> <p>"To recognize legally existing land uses as they exist at the time this Plan is adopted. Such land uses shall be deemed to conform to this Plan. Minor Extensions or expansions of such uses shall be permitted without amendment to this Plan, provided that the intent of this Plan is not compromised and the tests prescribed below, are met:"</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) For properties that are split designated General Employment and Prestige Employment would the General Employment uses such as transportation and outside storage be permitted on the portion of the site designated General Employment?</p> <p>5) The term "Ancillary Use" in Section 9.2.1.9 is not defined and is it necessary for the Official Plan to limit ancillary retail to 10%?</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.1.9 c) as written is "unrealistic" and the objectives of the policy would be better designed if it required appropriate mitigation of nuisances and adverse effects on neighbouring uses.</p> <p>7) Section 9.2.1.9 d) refers to "alternative measures" being applied to achieve compatibility between uses in the "General Employment" and other land-use designation. The term "alternative measure" is not defined.</p> <p>8) A question is raised whether the policies of Section 9.2.3.7 apply to new buildings or are they retroactive to existing employment buildings?</p>	<p>450 currently being used be included in the new Official Plan which provides for a "Prestige Employment" designation that extends one lot depth from the boundary road and detailed through the Block Plan process and By-law.</p> <p>5) The term typically is understood to be a use associated with the main use in the building. It will be defined in the implementing Zoning By-law for the Official Plan.</p> <p>Ancillary retail is limited to 10% in order to protect the City's employment land from retail and commercial uses which are otherwise better located in other land use designations designed to support the urban structure proposed by the Plan.</p> <p>6) Staff has recommended a policy be included in Section 5.2.1 that would require that new adjacent land uses to prepare the appropriate environmental or noise reports to ensure the proposed use does not destabilize the industrial use.</p> <p>7) Alternative measures can include noise walls, building design and other measures designed to mitigate impacts</p>	<p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) Refer to Recommendation 4) in Item 55.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>9) A request is made to amend the Prestige Employment Area policies of Section 9.2.2.10 a) to add the following text:</p> <p>“Areas designated as Prestige Employment will accommodate vehicles and truck for freight handling including the pick-up, delivery and transitory storage of raw materials and good incidental to motor freight shipment directly related to the General Prestige use.”</p> <p>10) The letter asks how the 7,500m² permissions for office uses in a Prestige Employment area are affected by the lot size.</p> <p>11) Important that policies in Section 9.2.2.19 b) do not undermine the Vaughan Marshalling Yard and private Open Storage objectives. Reference is made to the report: Implementing the Provincial “Growth Plan”: Revitalizing a Strategic Employment Area by Optimizing the Parkway Belt West lands to permit the Vaughan Marshalling Yard.</p>	<p>to achieve compatibility between uses. The policy is sufficiently flexible to require both compliance with MOE Guidelines and to review alternatives where they may be considered appropriate.</p> <p>8) The policies will not be applied retroactively to existing buildings. The policies will be applied to additions or expansions to existing buildings or new buildings on existing developed sites. Where zoning exists to permit development as-of-right and which does not comply with the new policies, the zoning permissions will remain in effect.</p> <p>9) It is not the intent of the Official plan to permit any outside storage, heavy truck operations in the Prestige Employment areas. These uses are proposed to be accommodated in the General Employment areas.</p> <p>10) Implementation of the Official Plan policies at this detail will occur in the zoning by-law, which must be enacted within 3 years of adoption of the Official Plan. Typical standards such as maximum lot coverage, building height, landscaping requirements, etc. will control how much office space can be</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>accommodated on any particular lot.</p> <p>11) The policies in the Official Plan will not undermine the marshalling yards. The Parkway Belt Plan recognizes land under Provincial jurisdiction and identifies infrastructure, utilities or other uses permitted under the Plan. The Official Plan includes an "Infrastructure and Utilities" designation for lands in the City with corresponding policies in Section 9.2.2.19.</p>	
<p>63C</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>LOCATION: Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent</p>	<p>See Issue under Item 63B.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 63B.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 63B.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
64	<p>DATE: May 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Mark Inglis</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) In the Kleinburg Core on Schedule 13, most lands abutting Nashville Road are designated "Low-Rise Residential" but should be the same as surrounding proposed Low-Rise Mixed Use Residential.</p> <p>2) Schedule 1 incorrectly depicts Wonderland as Natural Areas and Countryside.</p> <p>3) Schedule 9, Nashville Road should not be designated Major Arterial Road.</p> <p>4) Yonge Street is being planned without regard for surrounding municipalities.</p>	<p>1) The policies for the Kleinburg Core area are contained in OPA 633 as it amends OPA 601. This OPA is intended to be retained in Official Plan Volume 2, Site & Area Specific Policies.</p> <p>2) Revision to 'colour' depicting "Canada's Wonderland" site required.</p> <p>3) The draft City of Vaughan Official Plan and the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan recognizes the current designation of Nashville Road west of Highway 27 as an arterial; however, the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan supports changes to the road that will promote pedestrian and cyclist activity and engender a main street condition. To that end Vaughan Council on May 4, 2010 supported a recommendation to transfer ownership of the road to the City from the Region of York to better control traffic. No change should be considered at this time until a decision is made at the Region of York, in whose jurisdiction Nashville Road belongs.</p> <p>4) The Yonge / Steeles Corridor Study was undertaken in consultation with the Town of Markham, the City of Toronto, the Region of York and YRRT, their</p>	<p>1) No change recommended.</p> <p>2) Amend Schedule 1 to identify Canada's Wonderland as a "Community Area."</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) See Yonge Street Corridor Study for further details.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			plans and comments have been incorporated into the Plan.	
65A	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Miller Thomson LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 9 property, parish and mission interests throughout Vaughan</p>	<p>Concern with Places of Worship being excluded from Agricultural designations especially for the properties currently operating in agricultural areas.</p> <p>Request to consider including wording in OP to accommodate existing sites that are located on roads of less than the recommended 26m width.</p>	See Comment under Item 21.	See Recommendation under Item 21.
65B	<p>DATE: May 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT:</p>	Comments and recommendations concerning the proposed places of worship, policies in the draft Official Plan.	See Comment under Item 21.	See Recommendation under Item 21.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Miller Thomson LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 9 property, parish and mission interests throughout Vaughan</p>			
66	<p>DATE: June 19, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Royal LePage</p> <p>LOCATION: 5225 Highway 7</p>	<p>Request property land use designation be reviewed to allow commercial uses on the property.</p>	<p>The lands represent the first "Low-Rise Residential" lot east of the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation at the corner of Kipling Avenue and Highway 7. Limited retail use such as home occupations and private daycares would be permitted on the property. The site is accessed from Mackenzie Street which intersects Highway 7. Redesignating these lands for Commercial/retail purposes could set a precedent for properties along this street. No planning justification or other material was submitted in support of the request.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
67	<p>DATE: May 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 3790 Highway 7</p>	<p>1) Support the designation of subject lands Primary Centre and High-Rise Mixed Use.</p> <p>2) Policy 10.1.1.4 "no amendments to the Plan or the Zoning By-law be permitted prior to adoption of Secondary Plan" will freeze development and delay desired intensification. Request provisions to allow for existing permissions in OPA 500 (663) to continue to apply pending the adoption of the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>3) The built form requirements should take the form of guidelines and not be mandatory.</p>	<p>1) The subject lands are identified as Primary Centre on the Urban Structure Map of the Official Plan, and designated "High-Rise Mixed-Use" on the Land Use Schedule.</p> <p>2) Proponent would like City to undertake the Secondary Plan Study of Weston Road and Hwy. 7 in order that development can proceed directly after the Official Plan is approved. In the interim, proponent would like OPA 663 policies to continue to apply.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan is a valuable coordination tool that is required to review the planning issues related the development of this area. Accordingly the Secondary Plan process should be maintained.</p> <p>The Proponent may continue to develop under the provisions of the current zoning by-law applicable to these lands.</p> <p>The City will undertake the study as soon as possible after the approval of the Official Plan. It is important that this Primary Centre develop as envisioned in the Official Plan.</p> <p>3) Proponent would like more flexibility</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) It is recommended that the City undertake the Primary Centre Secondary Plan study for Weston Road and Hwy. 7 as soon as possible after the approval of the Official Plan. Until the Official Plan is approved, all current policies and zoning will remain in effect. Refer to policy change under Item 17C 1).</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>with respect to the built form policies of section 9.2.3.6.</p> <p>Section 9.2.1.2 does permit some flexibility to the effect that minor variations will be permitted to the built form policies, provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	
<p>68A</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MHBC Planning</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Dufferin Street and Centre Street</p>	<p>1) Requests the "Employment Area" structural designation be changed to "Primary Intensification Corridor".</p> <p>2) Remove Natural Areas and Countryside on property.</p> <p>3) Other three corners of Dufferin and Centre Street are designated "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" that permits residential uses and would like to request the northerly portion of lands be designated Mid-Rise Mixed-Use.</p>	<p>In the more recent letter (68 B), the proponent refines the issues. Clarification is requested respecting the discrepancies between Volume 1 and 2 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>1) Nonetheless, the lands maintain their current designation according to OPA 672 included in Volume 2.</p> <p>2) The parcel appears to include the Core Features designation of the Natural Heritage Network according to Schedule 2. The Core Feature designation does not appear on Schedule 13-T. The parcel does not include a Significant</p>	<p>1) Schedule 1 should be amended to designate the lands as "Community Area" consistent with Schedule 13-T identifies the lands as Commercial Mixed-Use.</p> <p>2) Amend Schedule 2 to remove the "Core Features" designation from the lands.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Forest according to the Region of York study. The parcel does not include Terrestrial Resources as identified in OPA 600. The area is noted as a possible inter-regional trail in Don River Watershed Report, and not as Existing or Potential Cover.</p> <p>3) Re-designation of these lands as requested by the proponent would require further study through a future study of the OPA 672 area. Refer to discussion under 50C, 51B and 51C.</p>	
<p>68B</p>	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MHBC Planning</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Dufferin Street and Centre Street</p>	<p>Draft OP in Schedule 1 identifies the subject land as including Primary Intensification Corridor, Employment Area, Natural Area, and Countryside. Volume 2 identifies subject land as subject to OPA 672 and a Secondary Plan. Request clarification on discrepancies.</p>	<p>To clarify, the policies of Volume 2, Centre Street Secondary Plan (OPA 672), require Council approval of a Concept Plan for the entire area designated Prestige Area. The Concept Plan must be approved prior to consideration of zoning by-law and site plan applications. The Concept Plan should address the location of local roads, street access points, pedestrian connections, buildings, etc.</p> <p>Re-designation of these lands as requested by the proponent would require further study through a future study of the OPA 672 area.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
69	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7</p>	<p>Request that the current "Service Node" designation be maintained on the subject lands.</p>	<p>Staff concurs with the request.</p>	<p>To reflect the approved Huntington Business Park- Block Plan apart from the designations proposed for Highway No.7 and the Northwest corner of Highway No.427 and 407.</p> <p>Recommend that Schedules 13 and 13-P be amended to reflect the designations shown on OPA No.450 as refined by the Huntington Business Park Block Plan with the exceptions noted above.</p>
70	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 10901 Highway 50</p>	<p>1) Request to incorporate the site specific provisions of OPA 570 into the new OPA and to include additional uses: automobile service station, a hotel/motel, banquet hall and conference centre.</p> <p>2) Requested change to the Agricultural designation on appropriate schedules and delete the Core Feature designation as it is noted that TRCA previously agreed to deleting the stream channel.</p>	<p>1) The subject lands have a site specific OPA (OPA No.570) which permits the lands to be developed for a truck dealership and repair facility, truck parking and display, restaurant with drive through and re-fuelling station. By-Law 265-2002 indicates that the By-Law will not come into effect until OPA 570 is in full force. By-Law 265-2002 refers to Schedule E-1263, which provides only the outline of the property with the 'H' Holding symbol and provides not information regarding the drainage feature.</p> <p>The lands are subject to a site-specific zoning by-law which maintain the development permissions on the site to implement OPA 570. The lands are also</p>	<p>1) No change recommended.</p> <p>2) No change recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>shown as Strategic Employment Lands in the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by Council December 2009).</p> <p>2) The lands are vacant and zoned C2(H) General Commercial Zone with an 'H' Holding symbol subject to site plan approval. The delineation or deletion of the drainage channel, will be addressed at the Site Plan stage.</p>	
<p>71A</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>See Issue under Item 71B.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 134.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 134.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
71B	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Drive-Throughs</p> <p>1) Proponent represents a number of fast food restaurants as well as their industry group association, the Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA) and presented a list of benefits provided by drive-throughs.</p> <p>2) Review of case law at OMB and the courts support drive-through facilities not being prohibited at the level of the Official Plan and they object to any new and further prohibition of drive-through facilities at the level of the Official Plan.</p> <p>3) Disagrees that drive through facilities do not contribute to the sustainability goals of the City.</p> <p>4) Supports developing performance standards based policies within the broad Official Plan and related secondary plans on drive-through facilities rather than outright prohibition in the OP for some areas of the City, together with identifying any particular areas of restrictions at the level of the zoning by-laws.</p>	See Comment under Item 134.	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
73A	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: North side of Highway 7, west of Highway 427</p>	<p>1) Schedule 13-P appears to have depth of 100m for "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation versus the 200m depth for "Prestige Areas" - Centres & Avenue Seven Corridor in OPA 660.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.2.2.7 (b) uses restrictive. Request list of permitted uses reflect uses permitted in OPA 660.</p> <p>3) Policy 5.2.3 and 9.2.2.7 (c) requirements for retail uses to form part of mixed-use would significantly reduce the number and range of retail development opportunities from those currently permitted by OPA 660.</p> <p>4) New policies will restrict interim development .</p> <p>5) Request permissions on Commercial Mixed-Use designation be modified to delete retail to form part of mixed-use and the requirements that retail not exceed 50% to total GFA.</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.2.9 (b)- Request that draft OP be modified to retain permission for retail warehouses within General Employment areas.</p> <p>7) Policy 5.2.3.7- Request the drive-</p>	<p>1) The respondent is correct. The mapping will be adjusted to reflect a 200 m depth for the "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation.</p> <p>2) The Policies set out in the new Official Plan restrict the amount of retail uses within Employment Areas. This is consistent with the policy objective of "employment land protection" of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan (S.4.4.6).</p> <p>3) Refer to comment 2 above.</p> <p>4) An overall objective within the draft Official Plan is to develop complete communities with compact urban form that supports transit service and promotes walking, cycling and healthy living and to identify a hierarchy of mixed-use centres to be developed in a compact form and at appropriate densities to support transit service. Interim uses are not being contemplated as they do not meet the intent of the Plan.</p> <p>5) Policy 9.2.2.7 (c) requires that retail uses within Commercial Mixed-Use</p>	<p>1) Amend Schedule 13 to reflect a 200m wide "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) The referenced policies in 9.2.2.7. (c) should be revised as follows: "In areas designated as Commercial Mixed-use, a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot shall consist of uses other than retail uses."</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) Refer to recommendation in Item 134.</p> <p>8) Policy 5.2.3.6 should be modified as follows: Major retail uses (those retail uses over 10,000 square metres on any single lot) are not permitted in Employment Areas. Such uses are permitted in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and Primary Centres. Major retail uses are also permitted through a Zoning By-law Amendment, in Local Centres, Primary</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>through permission found in the current planning regime remain, as policy 5.2.3.7 of draft OP prohibits a drive-through in Intensification Areas.</p> <p>8) Policy 5.2.3.6- Request sub policies (a), (b), (c) be modified to create more appropriate market impact tests</p> <p>9) Policy 2.2, 5.2 and 9.1- Request to be more flexible with urban design and built form policies.</p> <p>10) Policy 10.1.3- Request the reference to site plan approval in complete application policies be deleted.</p>	<p>designations shall not exceed 50 percent of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot. The City recognizes that 50 percent of non-retail uses may be difficult to achieve, therefore the policy will be modified and reduced to 30 percent for non-retail uses.</p> <p>6) Refer to comment 2) above.</p> <p>7) Refer to discussion in Item 134.</p> <p>8) Policy 5.2.3.6. should be modified to remove requirement for Commercial Impact Study and Planning rationale; remove Community Areas as areas prohibited from Major Retail Uses; and remove requirement in sub-policy (a) – the economic health and vitality of existing retail areas and main streets in Vaughan not adversely impacted.</p> <p>9) Policy 9.1.2.1 provides flexibility in the Built Form policies except for height and density, provided they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>10) The intent of Policy 10.1.3. (site plan approval in complete application process) is currently provided for in OPA #705, approved by Council on</p>	<p>Intensification Corridors and Local Centres subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>a. there will continue to be sufficient market demand to ensure that Intensification Areas will have the ability to attract retail opportunities and that such opportunities are not diminished by the proposed major retail use;</p> <p>b. the minimum trade area population required to service the proposed major retail use exists or will exist when the facility is constructed;</p> <p>c. the local and surrounding street network is not adversely impacted by traffic;</p> <p>d. sufficient water, sewer and stormwater capacity exists;</p> <p>e. the development is sited and oriented to support walking, cycling and transit use; and,</p> <p>f. urban design guidelines are established for major retail development to ensure a high-quality public realm and high-quality built form.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>December 19, 2009 and currently in effect. The policies set out in Section 10.1.3. of the new Official Plan carries over the existing policy.</p>	
<p>73B</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: North side of Highway 7, west of Highway 428</p>	<p>1. Policy 5.2.3 - Request OP be modified to express permission for existing stand alone large scale developments.</p> <p>2. Request that the requirement for retail uses to be part of mixed-use development in policy 5.2.3.4(a) be deleted.</p> <p>3. Request that the requirement for retail not exceed 50 percent of total gross floor area for all uses on a lot be deleted. (Policies 5.2.3 & 5.2.3.4(a) & 9.2.2.7(c) & 9.2.2.2(d) & 9.2.2.4(d) & 9.2.2.6(d).)</p> <p>4) Policy 9.2.2.9(b) Request modification</p>	<p>1) Policies in Section 2.1.3 identifies the City's 'Key Planning Objectives" in the New Official Plan. The policies of this section supports "Intensification" and "compact" development as a 'key Planning Objectives'. To achieve this, the policies are expanding the range of permitted residential and office uses on low density commercial sites. Therefore, permitting the development of single stand-alone commercial development would be counter the Planning Objectives of the Official Plan.</p> <p>2) Refer to comments above.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) The referenced policies in 9.2.2.7. (c) should be revised al follows: "In areas designated as 'Commercial Mixed Use' the zoning by-law shall require a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot to consist of uses other than retail uses."</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) Refer to recommendation in Item 134.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>to retain permission for retail warehouses within General Employment areas.</p> <p>5) Policy 5.2.3.7 Request that drive-through permission found in the current planning regime remain.</p> <p>6) New policies will restrict interim development.</p> <p>7) Policy 9.1.2.5 (c) & (d), Policy 9.2.3.4(c) & 9.2.3.5(e) & 9.2.3.7(d) Request that these policies be deleted or alternatively be modified to reflect that parking requirements and restrictions do not apply to the interim development of lands</p> <p>8) Policy 9.2.3.4(d) Request that the policies be deleted, or alternately, modified to reflect that rooftop requirements in the policies do not apply to the interim development.</p> <p>9) Policy 10.1.3 Request the reference to site plan approval in complete application policies be deleted.</p> <p>10) Policy 5.2.3.6- Requests that the policy be deleted since it sets market tests which are inappropriate.</p>	<p>3) Policy 9.2.2.7 (c) requires that retail uses within Commercial Mixed-Use designations shall not exceed 50 percent of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot. The City recognizes that 50 percent of non-retail uses may be hard to achieve, In areas designated as "Commercial Mixed Use" the zoning by-law shall require a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot to consist of uses other than retail uses.</p> <p>4) Refer to comments 1) above.</p> <p>The Policies set out in the New Official Plan restrict the amount of retail uses within Employment Areas. This is consistent with the policy objective of "employment land protection" of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan.</p> <p>5) Refer to response under Item 134.</p> <p>6) Refer to response under Item 73A 4).</p> <p>7) Refer to 73A 4).</p> <p>8) It is an overall policy objective of the</p>	<p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change recommended. <speak to USI about interim development></p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) Policy 5.2.3.6 should be modified as follows:</p> <p>Major retail uses (those retail uses over 10,000 square metres on any single lot) are not permitted in Employment Areas. Such uses are permitted in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and Primary Centres. Major retail uses are also permitted through a Zoning By-law Amendment, in Local Centres, Primary Intensification Corridors and Local Centres subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>a. there will continue to be sufficient market demand to ensure that Intensification Areas will have the ability to attract retail opportunities and that such opportunities are not diminished by the proposed major retail use;</p> <p>b. the minimum trade area population required to service the proposed major retail use exists or will exist when the facility is constructed;</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Official Plan to design and built sustainable buildings. This is an important initiative that should be supported whenever and wherever development occurs. Through the Development Review process, the City will be implementing more detailed sustainable building initiatives that inform this policy in the future.</p> <p>9) The intent of Policy 10.1.3. (site plan approval in complete application process) is currently provided for in OPA #705, approved by Council on December 19, 2009 and currently in effect. The policies set out in Section 10.1.3. of the new Official Plan carries this existing policy over. See comment 7 above respecting interim development.</p> <p>10) Policy 5.2.3.6. should be modified to remove requirement for Commercial Impact Study and Planning rationale; remove Community Areas as areas prohibited from Major Retail Uses; and remove requirement in sub-policy (a) – the economic health and vitality of existing retail areas and main streets in Vaughan not adversely impacted.</p> <p>Refer to Comment under Item 34.</p>	<p>c. the local and surrounding street network is not adversely impacted by traffic;</p> <p>d. sufficient water, sewer and stormwater capacity exists;</p> <p>e. the development is sited and oriented to support walking, cycling and transit use; and,</p> <p>f. urban design guidelines are established for major retail development to ensure a high-quality public realm and high-quality built form</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
74	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: David Suzuki Foundation</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter states that Vaughan is at a crossroads. Down one path is urban sprawl. The other path is smart growth and creating compact, high density communities. Many municipalities have started looking at ways to make their communities smarter and more compact. The David Suzuki foundation urges Vaughan to protect the remaining near-urban farms, field and forests. By preventing sprawl, Vaughan will create incentives for the city to intensify growth. Farmland and green spaces provide a wide reange of ecological services for free such as filtering and storing water and preventing erosion. Replacing ecological services with engineered solutions can cost millions of dollars. Freezing urban expansion is one of the most effective ways to reduce emissions and heat-trapping greenhouse gases that cause global warming.</p>	<p>The population projections to be accommodated by the City are mandated from the Province of Ontario, through the Regional Municipality of York. The Region of York has initiated Official Plan Amendment #2 to the Regional Official Plan for the purposes of approving the two new urban expansion areas in Vaughan. The City's Official Plan must conform to the Regional Plan. The proposed urban expansion is the smallest in Vaughan's history representing approximately 3% of the City's total land area over a 20 year planning horizon.</p> <p>Through analysis conducted by Hemson Consulting and Urban Strategies Inc. it was concluded that approximately 85% of the City's forecast housing demand to 2031 can be accommodated within the existing urban area. The remaining 15% could be met through a modest urban boundary expansion as a means to address the City's forecast long term land requirements, because:</p> <p>a) the identified intensification opportunities being reflected in the draft Official Plan will fully satisfy the Region's requirement of 45% of forecast future housing units within the Built Boundary,</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>and will exceed the Growth Plan's policy directive of 40%;</p> <p>b) reliance upon intensification to address all of the City's forecast future housing needs is unrealistic given evidence of market preferences and demand for low density housing types;</p> <p>c) excessively restricting the availability of lands for lower density housing may result in inflated land and housing prices, creating affordability concerns as well as encouraging sprawl in other areas of the region less appropriate to accommodate it;</p> <p>d) minimal opportunity exists to achieve additional development within designated Greenfield areas as planning approvals are already in place for nearly all such lands, and most are already in the process of development; and</p> <p>e) a modest amount of urban expansion will supplement the remaining supply of Greenfield area and provide for balance in the housing market.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan identifies Blocks 27 and 41 for residential community urban expansion and development,</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>subject to completion of secondary plans which will be required to achieve the Regional minimum density requirements of 20 residential units per hectare and 70 residents and jobs per hectare, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan also establishes a comprehensive set of policies to create complete communities with a range of residential densities and a mix of land uses in keeping with Provincial and Regional initiatives. These policies require that a Secondary Plan and a Block Plan be prepared.</p>	
<p>75</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Jim Keenan</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) Urge to preserve the agricultural lands outside the urban boundary. Propose an "Agricultural Economic Zone". This means that incentives and legislation be put on stream to create agricultural easements to protect this land which specify that the land will not be used for urban or industrial development.</p> <p>2) Should allow for subdivision of farm land smaller than 40 hectares.</p> <p>3) Allow zoning policies that permit on-farm processing and sales.</p>	<p>1. The lands outside of the urban boundary have been designated as "Agricultural" to protect these lands for agricultural purposes with supporting policies. Identification of an "Agricultural Economic Zone" and incentives and legislation is typically not an Official Plan issue.</p> <p>2. Permitting severances of lots smaller than 40 ha would facilitate development pressure in the Agricultural Area which is not supported by the Plan.</p> <p>3. Upon review of the zoning by-law (within 3 years of approval of the</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			approval of the Official Plan) this issue can be reviewed.	
76	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association (KARA)</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter expressed opposition to the proposed urban boundary expansion for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Population numbers from Hemson Report is dependent on City's Secondary Plans which are not complete. Recommend Council defer decision for overall plan until public comments for secondary plans are heard.</p> <p>2) City should allow for intensification in existing area for next 5-10 years followed by comprehensive review to determine whether further urban boundary expansion is required.</p> <p>3) Secondary suites will allow for new units and easy way to slightly increase densities within existing residential housing stock.</p> <p>4) City needs to do comprehensive</p>	<p>1) and 2) Refer to Comments under Item 34.</p> <p>3) The Plan includes policies with respect to undertaking a Secondary Suites Study.</p>	<p>1) and 2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) and 5) The Hwy 400 North Employment Lands and New Community Areas (Block 27 and 41) require a Master Environmental Servicing Plan that will address environmentally sensitive lands.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended. Comment will be taken under consideration in the CofW report on the Kleinburg North Secondary Plan.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>economic development strategy for agricultural preservation and for sensitive lands environmental review.</p> <p>5) Concerned about the environmentally sensitive lands abutting the Highway 400 expansion.</p> <p>6) The Kleinburg-Nashville Focus Area Study should have regard for development to be: phased and modest, respect heritage conservation, approved only after appropriate studies are completed.</p>		
77	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: North side of Rutherford Road, west of Highway 27</p>	<p>1) Policy 3.2.1.2- Wish to confirm interpretation that this policy provides for flexibility in determining the precise boundaries of natural areas based on the appropriate supporting studies being completed on a site specific basis.</p> <p>2) Policy 10.2.1.4- wish to confirm the removal of lands designated Core Features or Natural Areas designations, would not require an amendment to the OP if minor and meet intent of plan.</p>	<p>1) It is requested to permit minor changes to Core Features based on evidence and that such changes do not require an Official Plan amendment. Policy 3.2.3.2 (erroneously noted as 3.2.1.2 on Page 56 of the OP) addresses the issue of minor modification to Core Features. Furthermore, a policy will be added to the section on Core Features that permits minor modifications to Core Features based on appropriate studies. Refer to Item #19B for details of the revised Core Features policies.</p> <p>2) Additional text is provided in relation to Policies 3.2.3.4 to 3.2.3.9 to specify</p>	<p>1) and 2) Refer to Item 19B for details of the revised Core Features policies.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>the ability to make minor modifications to Core Features that do not require an amendment to the Official Plan. Refer to Item #19B or details of the revised Core Features policies.</p>	
<p>78</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Embee Properties Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>See Issue under Item 134.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 134.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 134.</p>
<p>79</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Major Mackenzie Property Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Policies do not reflect appropriately the purpose of drive-through facilities nor recognize their essential value.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 134.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 134.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
80	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest Nashville Road and Highway 27</p>	<p>1) Request that the approved existing land use policy which applies to the subject lands continue to be in effect.</p> <p>2) Objection to eastern portion of site beyond the top-of-bank being designated Natural Areas.</p>	<p>1) The lands are subject to Zoning Amendment application (Z.147.85) and draft plan of subdivision file 19T-84076 which were recently approved by the OMB (File PL060885). These approvals will facilitate the development of the subject lands.</p> <p>2) It is noted that the Core Features designation extends beyond Greenbelt Plan area. There is an approved Plan of Subdivision for the lands and it was the subject of an OMB Decision issued April 11, 2008.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) That Schedule 13-G be amended to redesignate the lands from "Natural Areas" to "Low-Rise Residential".</p>
81	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Iain Craig</p> <p>LOCATION: 365 Stegman's Mill Road</p>	<p>The letter states that Kleinburg has already experienced growth. Believes that Area 5 is already within the urban boundary. Process should allow for lands that have been designated to an urban use to revert back to Agricultural uses. Opposed to the proposed urban expansion. The loss of agricultural lands and traffic should stop urban expansion.</p>	<p>Refer to Comment under Item 34.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
82	<p>DATE: May 18, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Malone Given Parsons Ltd.</p>	<p>Request designation change from proposed "Natural Areas and Countryside" to "Community Area" on Schedule 1 - Urban Structure" and from "Private Open Spaces to Low Rise Residential" on Schedule 13 - Land Use.</p>	<p>The Core Features are within the Greenbelt boundary. The tableland portion is currently shown as Private Open Space on Schedule 1. Staff has reviewed the request and can support designating the tableland portion of the</p>	<p>That Schedule 1 be amended to designate the tableland portion of the lands as "Community Area".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: 11191 Highway 27 (Copper Creek Golf Club)</p>	<p>Concern "natural area" and "countryside" create perception lands will be kept as open space to benefit public even though a private business.</p>	<p>lands as "Community Area" on Schedule 1.</p>	
<p>83A</p>	<p>DATE: May 18, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Templeton Planning Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: South of Teston Road, east and west of Pine Valley Drive</p>	<p>1) The proponent points out that the City of Vaughan and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) advised that the current Block Plan process would be "grandfathered" or "transitioned" based on previous correspondence.</p> <p>2) That Section 5.2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan enables conclusion of the development approvals in Block 40/47 based on the development limits staked in 2004.</p> <p>3) That the development limits staked in 2004 provide the basis for defining the "Community Area boundary at this time".</p> <p>4) Requests revision to the Urban Structure (Schedule 1) and Land Use (Schedule 13) to reflect the staked development limits as provided in a "revised proposed Block 40/47 Block Plan" submitted to the City in March 2008</p>	<p>1) The letter from MMAH dated April 11, 2005 does not refer to transitioned or grandfathered applications. The letter from the City dated April 12, 2005 interprets the Block 40/47 applications to be transitional. It is also stated in the letter to confirm the interpretation with MMAH and with the applicant's legal counsel prior to finalizing any transaction.</p> <p>2) Section 5.2.1 can be interpreted to allow an application to proceed where "an official plan was amended prior to December 16, 2004 to specifically designate land use(s)...". However, it is not correct to assume that the development limits staked in 2004 are entrenched. The development limits are yet to be agreed upon by the City in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.</p> <p>3) The development limits have not been agreed upon by the City in consultation with the Toronto and Region</p>	<p>1) THAT no further action to be taken at this time.</p> <p>2) and 3) It is recommended to define the "Community Areas" on Schedule 1 of the Official Plan on the basis of Schedule 'B' of OPA 600.</p> <p>4) It is recommended delineate the Block 47 lands in the Greenbelt as "Community Area" on Schedule 1 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>It is recommended to continue to map the Greenbelt according to the Greenbelt Plan as the Greenbelt Act applies to those lands.</p> <p>It is recommended that the underlying land use designation on Schedule 13 will be Agriculture.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Conservation Authority. Furthermore, the applications have not been adopted by Council. OPA 600 defines the "Urban Villages and Urban Expansion Area" on Schedule 'A' and further defines the Block 40/47 area as "Valley Lands" and "Urban Area" on Schedule 'B'.</p> <p>"Community Areas" should be defined on Schedule 1 of the Official Plan on the basis of Schedule 'B' of OPA 600.</p> <p>4) It is recommended delineate the Block 47 lands in the Greenbelt as "Community Area" on Schedule 1 of the Official Plan and to continue to map the Greenbelt according to the Greenbelt Plan as the Greenbelt Act applies to those lands.</p> <p>The underlying land use designation on Schedule 13 will be Agriculture. This continues the policies of OPA 600 with respect to Blocks 40 and 47 as set out in Section 4.2.1.2 of OPA 600. Specifically, it is noted in subsection (iii) that the "lands designated as Urban Area shall remain subject to the Rural Use area, Rural-General and Agriculture Area policies of OPA 600 until such time as they are redesignated to specific urban land use categories, by an</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>amendment to this Plan, adopted by the City and approved.” As there are no approvals, the Agriculture designation in the new Official Plan is consistent with the policy intent of OPA 600. The applications can continue to proceed and the development limits will be determined according to appropriate evaluations.</p>	
<p>83B</p>	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Templeton Planning Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 40/47</p>	<p>1) Request revision to Policy 7.3.3.4 respecting calculation of Parkland Dedication, as it bears no correlation to the actual needs of the community residents for parkland or to any test of fairness or reasonableness.</p> <p>2) Policies 9.1.1.3b) and 9.1.1.4d) concerning the prohibition of rear-lotting on public streets and limiting and discouraging cul-de-sacs and window streets, severely confines design approaches along arterial roads. The proponent is requesting that the policies should be revised to allow for greater flexibility.</p> <p>3) Policy 9.1.1.8e) “orienting new development to avoid or limit rear-lotting</p>	<p>1) A number of municipalities in the GTA utilize similar Parkland dedication rates as the City of Vaughan. The Official outlines parkland dedication requirements for residential and non-residential development in Sections 7.3.3.2 and 7.3.3.3.</p> <p>As the City’s parkland dedication rates are consistent with other municipalities in the GTA, no changes to the policies are contemplated.</p> <p>2) and 3) Policy 9.1.1.4 (d) - limits and discourages cul-de-sacs and window streets, and Policy 9.1.1.8. (e) – orientating new development to avoid rear-lotting onto natural areas (which tends to render these areas</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended</p> <p>2) No change is recommended</p> <p>3) No change is recommended</p> <p>4) No change is recommended</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>onto natural areas...". The proponent find the policy as presently worded is unrealistic and a hardship for development lands with an extensive valley interface. Policy should be revised to encourage valley exposure opportunities without condemning rear lotting.</p> <p>4) Policy Section 9.2.2.13 respecting lands appearing on Schedule 3 (Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Boundaries) and the "grandfathering" of lands from Greenbelt Plan provisions.</p> <p>5) Policy 9.2.2.1b) 1v) respecting the maximum of 185 square metres GFA for small scale convenience in Low Rise Residential designations. The proponent is requesting that the policy be revised to allow flexibility so that the necessary critical mass of convenience uses can be achieved to ensure viability.</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.2.13b) respecting the density target of 20 units per hectare. Requesting that Block 40/47 proceed in accordance with density parameter that may be lower than the minimum specified in Section 9.2.2.13.</p>	<p>unaccessible to the public) and, instead providing public realm elements adjacent to natural areas, such as a public street, park or landscaped walkway.</p> <p>The subject policies do not prohibit the aforementioned design features, rather, where it can be avoided alternative best practices are preferred. Design features to be determined through the development planning process.</p> <p>4) Outstanding requirements remain for these lands, therefore it is recommended that until such time as the Block Plan has been approved by Council, shall these lands be designated as such. Mapping revision required for underlying designation until such time as the Block Plan has been approved by Council.</p> <p>5) The policy directs larger retail uses to more appropriate locations in the City. A commercial permissions in the low-rise residential designation is considered appropriate.</p> <p>6) See comment number 4) above</p> <p>7) Asks for clarification if the requirement for a sub-watershed study in Policy 9.2.2.13.d.ii applies to Block</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>7) Policy 9.2.2.13d) (ii) respecting the requirement for a preceding or concurrent sub-watershed study by TRCA with in New Community Areas.</p> <p>8) Policy 10.1.1.1 respecting requirement for further Secondary Plans identified on Schedule 14. Proponent requesting explanation as to why lands are not referenced.</p>	<p>40/47.</p> <p>8) The lands in question are subject to the 'Block Plan" process, which is separate from the Secondary Plan process. Lands subject to the Secondary Plan process are identified on Schedule 14.</p>	
<p>84</p>	<p>DATE: May 18, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: South of Rutherford Road and east of Jacob Keefer Parkway</p>	<p>1) Request that the lands located on the south side of Rutherford Road, between west of Jacob Keefer Parkway and the "Natural Areas" be designated "Commercial Mixed-Use" of "Prestige Employment".</p>	<p>The lands are currently zoned C7 Service Commercial Zone by By-law 1-88. A "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation would be more consistent with the zoning on the site.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-O be amended to redesignate the lands from "Prestige Employment" to "Commercial Mixed-Use".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
85	<p>DATE: May 18, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: 10951 Kipling Avenue</p>	<p>Development applications (Files OP.09.003 and Z.09.026) have been submitted to permit a multi-purpose recreational complex on the subject land. Opposed to the draft OP proposal to redesignate subject lands from "Rural" to "Agricultural".</p> <p>Requests that the "Rural" designation remain with permissions for recreational uses inclusive of a golf course, picnic area, ice rink, swimming pool, tennis courts, soccer fields, bocci courts, lawn bowling, ancillary club house and administrative facilities.</p>	<p>Block 48 is entirely in the Greenbelt Plan area and identified as an Agricultural Area according to Map #8 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by Council in Dec. 2009). The Agricultural designation in the City Official Plan (Volume 1) is consistent with Region of York Official Plan. There is no Rural Areas designation in the new City Official Plan.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
86	<p>DATE: May 18, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Humber North Extension Area</p>	<p>Request that the land use designation be corrected to reflect a "Low-Rise Residential" land use designation as permitted within the current OPA 601.</p>	<p>The lands are subject to current development applications. Under the Regional Official Plan, the lands are designated as "Town and Village". Under this designation, new development is subject to comprehensive secondary plans. The lands are also subject to OPA 601 requiring further analysis. No change is recommended to Schedule 13 and 13-G until the development applications are considered by Council.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
87	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Susan Sigrist</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Does not support urban expansion into Blocks 27 and 41.</p> <p>1) Protect Terrestrial Natural Heritage System and Headwaters of the Upper Don River in Block 27.</p> <p>2) Request continued use as agricultural for local produce.</p> <p>3) Current urban boundary should be intensified to support proposed transit system.</p> <p>4) allow secondary suites in existing residential areas.</p> <p>5) support the control of drive-throughs.</p> <p>6) Public not given enough time to discuss the urban boundary expansion and support five year moratorium on expanding onto whitebelt.</p>	<p>1) Regarding Block 27, the City's Natural Heritage Network includes Core Features and Enhancement Areas to implement aspects of the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System. Furthermore, New Community Areas, such as Block 27, require Secondary Plans that will also address the Natural Heritage Network in more detail.</p> <p>2) and 3) Refer to Comment under Item 34.</p> <p>4) A study will be undertaken respecting secondary suites in accordance with Policy 7.5.1.4 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>5) Comment only.</p> <p>6) The Official Plan has undergone a significant public process as outlined in the cover staff report.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
88	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 10275 Keele Street</p>	<p>Request that the lands be designated from "Low-Rise Residential" as shown in Schedule 13-J to "Mid-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>Surrounding lands at the corners of Keele Street and McNaughton Road, immediately to the west and south of the subject lands are designated Low-Rise Mixed-Use, with a maximum height of 3 storeys and maximum density of 1.25 FSI. Certain lands fronting on Keele Street between McNaughton Road and Major Mackenzie Drive are also designated Low-Rise Mixed-Use with the same height and density maximums. The lands are also bounded by a rail line, Keele Street, and McNaughton Road to the east, west and north respectively.</p> <p>In keeping with the surrounding land use context, the proposed Official Plan designation on the subject lands should be replaced with the Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation, and maximum 3 storey height and density of 1.25 FSI.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-J be amended to redesignate the lands from "Low-Rise Residential" to "Low-Rise Residential".</p>
89	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Templeton Planning Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest of</p>	<p>It is requested that "Natural Area" designations for the subject lands be changed and replaced in part with a "Low-Rise Residential" designation. Draft OP proposes to designate the subject lands as "Natural Areas" Schedule 2, and the Natural Heritage Network shows the lands as "Core Features" and "Enhancement Areas".</p>	<p>The approved Block Plan identifies the lands as Valley/Open Space and Woodlot. The OP designation is consistent with the approved Block Plan.</p> <p>The appropriate development limits and woodland restoration area consistent with any Region of York requirements and the Oak Ridges Moraine</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Dufferin Street and Rutherford Road Block 18	Schedules should be changed to reflect the submission of the Landform Analysis and a study entitled Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Conformity Report, Iacobelli Property - Block 18, City of Vaughan" in January 19, 2010.	Conservation Plan will be determined through the development review process.	
90B	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Parente, Borean LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 8294, 8298 and 8302 Islington Avenue</p>	Secondary Plan and OP Comments: Object to land use designation policies not limited to height, density, bonusing, and urban design. Site specific applications have been filed for subject property.	The Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan will form part of Volume 2 of the Official Plan. The Plan was prepared by the consultants, staff, and involved significant community consultation. The height and densities as provided in the plan are considered appropriate.	No change is recommended.
91	<p>DATE: May 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC)</p> <p>LOCATION: Jane Street and Highway 406</p>	Policy 2.2.6.2- Support potential transit-oriented development but request wording be changed.	The proposed policy change has been reviewed and staff support the policy as suggested.	That Policy 2.2.6.2 be amended as follows: "To recognize the potential of the Parkway Belt West site associated with the Highway 407 subway station as a prime opportunity for transit-oriented development and employment uses consistent with the City of Vaughan employment designations, and Provincial Growth Plan objectives, should such lands be declared surplus by the Province."

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>93</p>	<p>DATE: June 02, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 7700 Keele Street</p>	<p>The Official Plan designates to lands "Commercial Mixed-Use". Concerned that restrictions imposed by Section 9.2.2.9 will create a situation where intensification of this site will not be feasible unless the lands are designated "Mid-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>The lands are designated Employment Area on the Urban Structure Map (Schedule 7) of the Official Plan, and Commercial Mixed-Use with a maximum height of 10 storeys, and maximum density of 3.0 FSI on the Land Use Schedule 13-S.</p> <p>The lands are located within an existing employment area and located within a pocket of land which is entirely employment. The Hwy 7 frontage designated Commercial Mixed-Use is framed by the CN Railway line to the west, Keele Street to the east, Hwy. 7 to the north, and Hwy. 407 to the south.</p> <p>The Official Plan designation of Commercial Mixed-Use is appropriate within the surrounding land use context, and urban structure of the Plan. The designation should remain unchanged.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
<p>94A</p>	<p>DATE: June 02, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Rinaldo Orsi Vince Ussia George Knight</p> <p>LOCATION:</p>	<p>Request to be included in Community Area allowing for low rise residential uses.</p>	<p>The parcel west of Huntington Road, across from Area 2 in the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan, and east of the CP Rail tracks should be considered for residential development at some point in the future, in order to create a complete community as part of Area 2. The rail line acts as an effective boundary between residential and</p>	<p>A new Policy 2.2.3.7 should be added as follows:</p> <p>"That the lands fronting on Huntington Road, between the rail line to the west and the Huntington Road Community to the immediate east are recognized as an area for future residential development as an extension of the</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	11420 & 11180 Huntington Road and 6901 Kirby Road		employment land uses. While it may be premature to designate this western parcel as part of an urban expansion at this time, consideration should be given to include a policy that would allow for an Official Plan amendment in the future. The appropriate land use would be determined based on a planning justification supported by technical studies and analysis.	Huntington Road Community with the aim of establishing a more complete community. This extension will require an Official Plan amendment in the future."
94B	DATE: June 14, 2010 RESPONDENT: Rinaldo Orsi Vince Ussia George Knight LOCATION: 11420 & 11180 Huntington Road and 6901 Kirby Road	Request subject lands be considered for any future expansions and recognized as future low residential development.	See Comment under Item 94A.	See Recommendation under Item 94A.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>96</p>	<p>DATE: May 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p> <p>LOCATION: 30 & 36 Clarence Street and 86 & 92 Woodbridge Avenue</p>	<p>TRCA comments on subject lands regarding grade level commercial development within the Woodbridge SPA. Development / redevelopment / rehabilitation of and additions to existing buildings and structures are only permitted subject to the proposed development being flood protected to the Regulatory Flood elevation.</p>	<p>The Woodbridge Focus Review included a detailed analysis of the SPA policies in consultation with the TRCA, MNR, and MOE. The SPA policies in Volume 1 of the Official Plan should be taken from OPA 440. New SPA policies are provided in the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan, but must be approved by the Province. Until such time as the new SPA policies in the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan are approved by the Province, SPA policies in Section 3.6.3 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan will prevail.</p> <p>The current SPA policies, being those in OPA 440 and to be carried through in Section 3.6 of Volume 1 of the new Official Plan, require flood protection to the Regulatory Flood level. No distinction is made regarding type of use or between commercial uses and habitable floor space. The issue of allowing commercial uses at grade in the SPA should be discussed further between the TRCA and the City in finalizing the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan with respect to floodproofing requirements. TRCA has yet to provide comments on the Special Policy Area Justification Report.</p>	<p>it is recommended to seek comments from TRCA on the Special Policy Area Justification Report and engage in a specific discussion of commercial at grade uses in the SPA in select mixed use corridors in the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan area.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
97	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Delta Urban Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 50 to the west, Huntington Road to the east, between Major Mackenzie and Nashville Road.</p>	<p>States that the lands should be incorporated into the urban boundary since: this will promote the efficient use of water and wastewater infrastructure; lands have access to a future GO station along the Bolton route; and, supports the intent of the PPS and Places to Grow.</p>	<p>Through the Official Plan process, the City has reviewed potential areas for urban expansion. The lands are not identified for urban expansion and the request cannot be supported at this time.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
99A	<p>DATE: May 12, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 4477 and 4455 Major Mackenzie Drive</p>	<p>Request that the lands be designated "High-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>The City has identified appropriate areas for intensification through the Official Plan. The subject lands are not identified for intensification. Given existing surrounding low density and open space land use, the requested change is not supported at this time. The request is not supported by a planning justification study or other supporting material.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
99B	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 4477 and 4455 Major Mackenzie Drive</p>	<p>Request that the lands be designated "Mid-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 99A.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under 99A.</p>
100	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 2430 Teston Road</p>	<p>Policy 9.2.1.9</p> <p>1) Request that a site specific zoning by-law exemption be implemented on property that maintains a Place of Worship as permitted in By-law 1-88.</p> <p>2) Request site specific policy exception be included on our clients property that will maintain the ability to develop a place of worship/church on the site without an OP amendment.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>
101	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group</p>	<p>Draft OP Schedules 1, 13 and 13-A designate lands as "Natural Area" and Volume 2 does not recognize the approved development for Employment Uses through OPA 477 and site specific amendment Zoning By-law 1-88</p>	<p>The subject lands have been approved and developed for employment uses through OPA 477 and Zoning By-law 1-88, (Exception 9 (803)).</p> <p>The lands are designated Strategic</p>	<p>The mapping in the Official Plan should be corrected to reflect the site specific designation of OPA 477, and this OPA should be included in Volume 2 of the draft OP, under the Site Specific Policies.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 11245 Regional Road 50 and 11339 Albion-Vaughan Road</p>	<p>(Exception 9 (803)). Request approvals in OPA 477 be reflected in OP.</p>	<p>Employment Lands in the Region of York Official Plan. The lands are mapped incorrectly in the draft OP as Agricultural and Natural Areas.</p>	
<p>102</p>	<p>DATE: April 30, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Gary McKinnon</p> <p>LOCATION: 5670 Steeles Avenue West</p>	<p>1) West of property shows rail-line travelling north was built in 1976 but subsequently removed and all that remains is rail bed.</p> <p>2) Triangular parcel at the eastern boundary of the property outlined in white was purchased and is now one contiguous piece of land designated for industrial use.</p>	<p>1) The location of the spur line north of Steeles between Highway 27 and Martin Grove Road, South of Highway 7 be removed. Rail line no longer in operation as a rail road. Development currently existing over tracks.</p> <p>2) By-law 15-86 to stop-up, close and dispose of the subject parcel (Part 2 of R-Plan 65R-4745, and (Parts 1,2,3, and 4 of R-Plan 65R-4746) to the proponent, adopted by the City January 20, 1986.</p>	<p>1) Amend Schedules 13 and 13-Q to delete the railway symbol for the lands.</p> <p>2) Modifications on Schedules 13 and 13-Q required to revise designation from "public road" to show contiguous parcel as per By-law 15-86.</p>
<p>103</p>	<p>DATE: April 29, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Castlepoint Investments Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) A concern is raised that the Special Study Area in the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan is depicted as an Enhancement Area in Schedule 2 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>2) It is requested to delete a small area identified as "Enhancement Area" in Block 12 as it has already received draft approval and zoning as single family</p>	<p>1) The Enhancement Areas for the subject lands located in the study area of the Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan can remain on Schedule 2 and is described in more detail in the Secondary Plan. Where the Secondary Plan provides more detail than in Volume 1, then the Secondary Plan policies prevail. The Enhancement Areas policies recognize the underlying</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended. Refer to Item 19B for details of the Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>2) Schedule 13 will be adjusted according to draft approved Plan of Subdivision (19T-99V08).</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>condo block.</p>	<p>designation and should be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B for the revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>2) The Enhancement Area in Block 12 includes a stormwater pond and is intended to identify opportunities for naturalization when stormwater retrofits are planned. Any parts of the Enhancement Areas in this part of Block 12 that overlap development approvals will be removed according to draft approved Plan of Subdivision (19T-99V08).</p>	
<p>104</p>	<p>DATE: May 13, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Savanta Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Between Humber River on the east and the CP rail line and McGillivray Road to the west, north</p>	<p>Enhancement Areas in Block 60</p> <p>1) The extent of the Enhancement Areas mapping is questioned.</p> <p>2) It is recommended to focus on north-south linkages rather than east-west linkages.</p>	<p>1) The Enhancement Areas covering and in the vicinity of these properties are based on the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System "existing" and "potential" cover and the Regulated Area. The drainage divide between the Rainbow Creek subwatershed and the Main Humber "Bolton to Woodbridge" subwatershed occurs on the subject property. There are three permanent streams west of the Main Humber branch located on or in the vicinity of the subject property, two of which are</p>	<p>1) The Enhancement Area continues to serve the intended purpose of identifying connectivity opportunities based on the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>2) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item #19B for revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	of Rutherford Road.		<p>identified as warmwater streams and the third is not assigned. The Enhancement Area continues to serve the intended purpose of identifying connectivity opportunities based on the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>2) Examining north-south linkages in addition to east-west linkages are appropriate options if environmental studies evaluate connectivity options according to ecosystem function. Connectivity is not only for wildlife movement, but also for population dispersal (i.e. plant dispersal by small mammals and insects). Hence, connectivity can also be achieved through Open Space designations as well as Core Feature designations.</p>	
105	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: IBI Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Interchange lands between Highways 400, 407 ETR, Highway 7, and</p>	<p>1) Schedule 9 - Future Transportation Network. Concerned that a Highway 400 crossing and Proposed Minor Collector are partially on and adjacent to their lands.</p> <p>2) Policy 4.2.1.6 Street Network. Concerned with wording that provides for securing land for purposes including grade separated highway crossings.</p>	<p>1) The street network reflected on Schedule 9 is in accordance with the street network included in the draft Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan.</p> <p>2) The Regional Official Plan includes policies in Chapter 7, Streets, subsection 49, which speak to street widening and grade separations which may be required to ensure streets support all modes of transportation and the efficient</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Jane Street		movement of goods. Chapter 7, Streets, subsection 53 of the Regional Plan requires that local municipalities also design street systems as per the Regional policies of Chapter 7, Streets.	
107	<p>DATE: May 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: The Remington Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan Block 66 Whitebelt Lands; Carrville Centre; Jan-Sil Property; Block 60- East Elder Mills</p>	<p>1) Vaughan Block 66 Whitebelt Lands: Recommend these lands to be included in proposed urban expansion and incorporated into new OP if a deficit of Employment Lands exists, based on Employment Growth Outlook.</p> <p>2) Carrville Centre: Ensure that changes resulting from the development of the Urban Design Guidelines will be implemented in the current OP. Wish to better understand how OPA 651 will integrate with OP, understanding that Volume 2 will address these concerns.</p> <p>3) Jan-Sil Property Request that draft OP be updated to reflect what has been approved for subject lands. Depiction of subject lands in OP Schedule 1, Schedule 2, and Schedule 13-T runs counter to what has already been approved for subject lands.</p>	<p>1) The City through the Official Plan review has identified the urban expansion areas that can be supported at this time. The lands were not identified as an urban expansion area. Comments with regard to the East Elder Mills lands in Block 60 are addressed by the response and recommendations to Comment 24b.</p> <p>2) The changes resulting from the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study, approved by Council on June 29, 2010, be implemented into the Official Plan.</p> <p>The OPA 651 policies will be in effect. However, where OPA 651 (included in Volume 2) is silent on policies included in Volume 1, these policies will apply to the OPA 651 Amendment area.</p> <p>The OPA 651 policies will be in effect. However, where OPA 651 (included in</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) i. Amend Land Use Schedules 13 and 13-O to reflect the height and density provisions in accordance with the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study, approved by Council on June 29, 2010;</p> <p>ii. The Carrville Secondary Plan (OPA 651) mapping be amended and included into Volume 2 to reflect the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study, as approved by Council on June 29, 2010.</p> <p>iii. Amend Schedule 9 to reflect the revised road pattern outlined in the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study, as approved by Council on June 29, 2010.</p> <p>3) That Schedule 1 be amended to redesignate the lands from "Natural</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) Block 60- East Elder Mills Area on subject property designated as an "Enhancement Area" although there is no inherent environmental value and is composed of actively farmed land.</p>	<p>Volume 2) is silent on policies included in Volume 1, these policies will apply to the OPA 651 Amendment area.</p> <p>3) The Jan-Sil Property is located south of Hwy 7 on the east side of Bathurst Street. The York Region Atlas depicts the lot fabric and the registered Plan 65M-3195.</p> <p>The Natural Heritage Network mapping will be changed to reflect previous approvals for the subject property known as the Jan-Sil property.</p>	<p>Areas" and "Countryside" to "Community Areas" and, that Schedules 13 and 13-T be amended to redesignate the lands from "Natural Areas" to "Low-Rise Residential".</p> <p>4) Refer to Comment and Recommendation under Item 104.</p>
<p>108</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 39</p>	<p>1) Question the linear "Natural Areas" designation in the northwest corner of Block 39 extending northeasterly from the SWM pond on Pine Valley Drive as there are no natural features within the draft approved and registered plans of subdivision.</p>	<p>The linear Natural Area at the western edge of Block 39 adjacent to woodlands is questioned.</p> <p>The Enhancement Areas boundaries that include the stormwater ponds can remain while the linear feature separate from the woodlands is an error and will be removed.</p>	<p>that Schedule 13-M be amended to delete the linear "Natural Areas" designation and redesignate it "Low-Rise Residential".</p>
<p>109</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p>	<p>Draft OP designates property "Low-Rise Mixed-Use, D1.75 and H5. The site is currently developed with a gas station and a bank, both which have a drive-through and have capacity for additional buildings to be added in the future.</p>	<p>The lands are located at the intersection of Major Mackenzie Drive and Dufferin Street. The other 3 quadrants of the intersection are designated "Commercial Mixed-Use" with a building height of 12 storeys and FSI of 3.5. The lands abut</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-J be amended from "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" to "Commercial Mixed-Use" with a maximum building height and FSI of 12 storeys and 3.5, respectively.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Dufferin Street and Major Mackenzie Drive including Eagles Nest Golf Course</p>	<p>Request the site to be designated as "Commercial Mixed-Use" and with the same height and density as the remaining three quadrants of this intersection.</p>	<p>Eagles Nest Golf Course to the north. Redesignation of the site as requested is appropriate given the proposed surrounding land use designation and intensification of the site would not have an impact on abutting lands.</p>	
<p>110</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 9909 and 9939 Pine Valley Drive</p>	<p>The draft OP designates the lands as "Low-Rise Residential" and "Infrastructure and Utilities". These lands are the subject of current development applications to permit a seniors building having a maximum height of 9 storeys. It would appear this proposal would fit within the "Mid-Rise Residential" designation.</p> <p>Request designation as "Mid-Rise Residential with H9 and D 2.75.</p>	<p>As noted, this site is subject to current development applications. The City has identified areas for intensification through the Official Plan review. The subject lands were not included in any intensification areas. The surrounding land use context is primarily low density residential and open space. An area of the property has inadvertently been designated "Infrastructure and Utilities" which should be changed to "Low-Rise Residential".</p>	<p>No change is recommended with respect to the proposed designation on the lands.</p> <p>That Schedule 13-M be amended to change to "Infrastructure and Utilities" designation or a portion of the property to "Low-Rise Residential".</p> <p>No further redesignation is recommended.</p>
<p>111</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner</p>	<p>1) Provisions needs to be made in draft OP to grandfather, readopt or incorporate the existing approved Secondary Plans and related policies which ensure existing planning approvals conform to the Official Plan.</p> <p>2) Request consideration be given to extending the Primary Intensification</p>	<p>1) The lands are located within an approved Block Plan that has established the overall land use pattern for the block. In addition, the lands are subject to Zoning Amendment application (File Z.03.076) and draft plan of subdivision File (19T-03V13) through which the existing planning approvals will be implemented.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	of Major Mackenzie Drive and Bathurst Street	Corridor northerly along the entire Bathurst Street reach co-incident with the Regional Rapid Transit Corridor. Request to be notified	2) The Primary Intensification Corridor conforms to the Regional Official Plan. No planning justification report or other studies have been provided to support this request.	
112	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 72 Steeles Avenue West and 7040 Yonge Street</p>	<p>Comments for draft Citywide OP</p> <p>1) The draft Official Plan proposes High-Rise Mixed-Use (H30, D5) and Park which is generally supportive of designation but concerned about the extent of Parkland proposed on this site which appears to represent 35% of the land area.</p> <p>2) Policy 1.6 Structure and 1.7 How to Read this Plan- Volume 2 was only made available during the week of May 25th 2010, and did not allow sufficient opportunity to provide coordinated comments on the overall OP document in accordance with the City's schedule comments.</p> <p>3) Policy 2.1.3.2 j) - Request "...through the establishment of green development standards to be achieved by new development to the extent practical."</p> <p>4) Policy 4.2.3.8 - Should consider</p>	<p>Staff met with the consultant KLM Planning and discussed the substantive issues and have taken the detailed comments under consideration.</p> <p>12) Policy 9.1.1.9 speaks to establishing a Public Art program that may among other things, establish public art contributions from private development.</p>	<p>1) to 11) No change is recommended.</p> <p>12) Policy 9.11.9e) should change the words "associated with" to "from" and delete the word "equivalent".</p> <p>13) to 20) No change is recommended.</p> <p>Comments for draft Yonge/Steeles Secondary Plan will be dealt with as part of Volume 2.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>reduced parking standards in zoning by-laws in exchange for bicycle parking or bicycle sharing.</p> <p>5) Policy 4.3.2.2 - Introduce policy to implement reduced parking standards to recognize provision of bicycle parking, bicycle sharing, car pooling, car sharing and zero emission vehicle.</p> <p>6) Policy 4.3.2.3 - Clarify policy of cash in lieu of parking.</p> <p>7) Policy 7.1.1.3 - Vaughan can promote a balanced supply but not ensure a balanced supply of housing provided. Request replacing the word "shall have" with "will promote" which is consistent with Policy 7.5.1.1.</p> <p>8) Policy 7.3.1.2e) - Request parkland credit for Greenway that are 25m or greater, as Linear Parks are currently credited under OPA 600.</p> <p>9) Policy 7.3.3 - Parkland Dedication and 7.3.3.7- Request all parkland must be acquired as provided for under the provisions of the Planning Act.</p> <p>10) Policy 7.3.3.2 - Request that there is a maximum area which would be taken</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>from any one owner based on parcel size. This approach is used in the City of Toronto (see section 3.2.3 of the City of Toronto OP) and needs to be investigated for use in Vaughan.</p> <p>11) Policy 7.5.1.3 - Request section be removed as Vaughan cannot require all builders/developers to provide rental and special needs housing.</p> <p>12) Policy 9.1.1.9e) - Request section be deleted as public art contribution associated with private development is unreasonable and not appropriate in OP policy.</p> <p>13) Policy 9.2.1.5 and 9.2.1.6 - Request FSI figures be reviewed as OPAL 600 there are areas currently designated Medium Density Residential/Commercial which are zoned to permit on street townhouses. Based upon typical standards street townhouses could have an FSI significantly greater than 1.5 FSI proposed in the new OP.</p> <p>14) Policy 9.2.2.1 and 9.2.2.2 and 9.2.2.5 and 9.2.2.6 - Request clarification as built form policies are unclear. Do townhouse types include block townhouses as oppose to only</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>street related townhouses.</p> <p>15) Policy 9.2.3 - The level of detail not appropriate for an OP.</p> <p>16) Policy 9.2.3.2d) - Request clarification as section implies only street townhouses, and excludes block townhouses.</p> <p>17) Policy 9.2.3.2e) - Request revision as 18m separation is far in excess of the zoning standards.</p> <p>18) 9.2.3.3b) - 50m is an arbitrary number.</p> <p>19) Policy 9.2.3.3d) - Request revision as stacked townhouses are typically part of a block form development, with few of the units fronting onto public street.</p> <p>20) Policy 9.2.3.3e) - Why does the facing distance have to be greater than that of mid-rise building which is 15m.</p> <p>21) Policy 10.1.1.5 to 10.1.1.15 Block Plans - Request policies similar to 10.2.ix,a),b),c), of OPA 600 be incorporated for block plan approvals.</p> <p>Comments for draft Yonge Steeles</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Corridor Focus Study</p> <p>1) Section 3.3 Density - Request justification or amend policy to reduce quantum of office space.</p> <p>2) Section 3.6.10 - Publicly Accessible Open Space: Should be credited as part of the Parkland dedication required in this area.</p> <p>3) Section 4.1 Parks Location and 4.4 Parkland Conveyance - Request that there is a maximum area which would be taken from any one owner based on parcel size. This approach is used in the City of Toronto (see section 3.2.3 of the City of Toronto OP) and needs to be investigated for use in Vaughan.</p> <p>4) Section 5.2 and 5.3 New Local Streets - The density associated with the conveyance of these streets should be credited to the Owner providing the lands.</p> <p>5) Section 6.2 SWM - Concern there will be requirement to retrofit and introduce significant SWM facilities into area. Appendix B appears to contain criteria established by TRCA but cannot find associated policy references.</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>6) Section 8.1 Infrastructure - Request revision to require as conditions of approval on dedicated lands for local road network.</p> <p>7) Section 8.5 Development Plan - Request clarification.</p>		
<p>113A</p>	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 58 (Bounded by Rutherford Road, Langstaff Road, Highway 27 and Huntington Road.</p>	<p>1) Concern with the extent of the Natural Area designation shown on Schedule 13-L. What work was relied upon to determine limits.</p> <p>2) A concern is raised about the ability to undertake studies within 120 m of the natural features if the lands lie outside of a Block Plan.</p> <p>3) Concern with limitations on free standing office space and office accessory to a permitted employment use. Recommend the accessory office space provision undergo further review.</p>	<p>1) The delineation of the Natural Heritage Network is described in the background study, Natural Heritage in the City. Policy 3.2.3.2 addresses the ability to make minor modifications to Core Features. Additional text is provided in relation to Policies 3.2.3.4 to 3.2.3.9 to specify the ability to make minor modifications to Core Features. Refer to Item #19B for revised Core Features policies.</p> <p>Subject lands are located within the West Vaughan Employment Area. These matters will be addressed through the finalization of the West Vaughan</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended. The location of the District Park will be determined through the West Vaughan Employment Lands Secondary Plan and Block Plan Process.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) Request background material used in determining restrictions on retail use in employment area- floor area and locational restrictions.</p> <p>5) Recommend moving the District Park designation to land between HWY 427 and the Hydro Corridor, adjacent to the Community Multi-Use Recreational Pathway. Concerned the current designation is on valuable employment land.</p>	<p>Employment Areas Plan in Volume 2 and any mapping changes required to Volume 1 will be incorporated as required.</p> <p>2) Policy 3.2.4.3 of Volume 1 of the City of Vaughan OP is based on Policy 2.1.8 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by the Council of the Region of York in December 2009). The policy requires an Environmental Impact Statement within 120 m of the Natural Heritage Network. Furthermore, the issue of addressing impacts on natural features outside of the study area can also be addressed when determining the scope and Terms of Reference for a Master Environment and Servicing Plan.</p> <p>3) The restriction of office uses are intended to protect employment areas consistent with the Provincial and Regional policies. The respondent has not submitted a planning justification report or analysis in support of the request. This matter will be addressed through the finalization of the West Vaughan Employment Area Plan in Volume 2 and any mapping changes required to Volume 1 will be incorporated as required.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>4) The Policies set out in the New Official Plan restrict the amount of retail uses within Employment Areas. This is consistent with the policy objective of “employment land protection” of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan (S.4.4.6). Further background studies initiated by the City as part of the Official Plan review such as the Commercial Land Use Review and Housing and Employment Strategies, reiterate employment land and area protection.</p> <p>5) The location of the District Park will be determined through the West Vaughan Employment Lands Secondary Plan and Block Plan Process.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
113B	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Tarandus Associates Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 59</p>	<p>1) A series of points are raised regarding Core Features identified in Block 59, including a suggestion to define Core Features in the Definitions section of the Plan.</p> <p>2) A concern is raised that Rainbow Creek and West Rainbow Creek are corridors rather than core areas.</p> <p>3) A concern is raised that minor watercourses identified as Core Features have been reviewed by TRCA and determined not to be watercourses.</p> <p>4) No definition is provided for what constitutes a "woodland".</p> <p>5) No definition is provided for the terms "significant wildlife habitat" and "significant habitat of endangered species".</p> <p>6) The description used in Section 3.3 for "woodlands" is poor because an old field could be considered a woodlot.</p>	<p>1) Core Features are described in Section 3.2.3 and specifically on Page 55 of the May 2010 draft of the Official Plan.</p> <p>2) The author of the comment may not have reviewed Section 3.2.3 of the Official Plan in which the types of ecological features identified as Core Features are described, consistent with Section 2 of the Provincial Policy Statement. The Core Features identified on Schedule 2 follow TRCA generic regulation areas and/or Regionally Significant Forests. Furthermore, Rainbow Creek in the northeast part of Block 59 is also identified as part of the Regional Greenlands System (see Map 2 of the Region of York Official Plan adopted in December 2009).</p> <p>3) Select policies regarding Core Features will be modified and/or added to allow minor modification to Core Feature boundaries based on appropriate evaluations. Refer to Item 19B for revised Core Features policies.</p> <p>4) A woodland definition, based on the Region of York Official Plan, will be added to section 10.2.2 of the City of</p>	<p>1) No change recommended.</p> <p>2) No change recommended.</p> <p>3) Refer to Item 19B for revised Core Features policies.</p> <p>4) The definition of woodland will be added to Section 10.2.2 of the Plan.</p> <p>5) Definition for "habitat of endangered species" and "significant wildlife habitat" will be added to Section 10.2.2.</p> <p>6) It is recommended to add a policy that allows for development in a woodland under specified conditions.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Vaughan Official Plan. The definition of woodlands is as follows: A treed area of land at least 0.2 hectare in size with at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 1000 trees of any size, per hectare; b. 750 trees measuring over 5 centimetres diameter at breast height, per hectare; c. 500 trees measuring over 12 centimetres diameter at breast height, per hectare; or, d. 250 trees measuring over 20 centimetres diameter at breast height, per hectare, but does not include a cultivated fruit or nut orchard, a plantation established for the purpose of producing Christmas trees or nursery stock. For the purposes of defining a woodland, treed areas separated by more than 20 metres will be considered a separate woodland. <p>5) Definitions for "habitat of endangered species" and "significant wildlife habitat" will be added to Section 10.2.2 based on the definition in the Region of York Official Plan and the Provincial Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide. The definitions are as follows: Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species Habitat for endangered, threatened or</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>special concern species are identified by regulation under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Significant Wildlife Habitat (based on Region of York OP) Areas where plants, animals and other organisms live, and find adequate amounts of food, water, shelter and space needed to sustain their populations. Specific wildlife habitats of concern may include areas where species concentrate at a vulnerable point in their annual or life cycle; and areas which are important to migratory or non-migratory species. These areas are ecologically important in terms of features, functions, representation or amount, and contribute to the quality and diversity of an identifiable geographic area or natural heritage system. The Provincial Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide should be referenced to determine significant wildlife habitat.</p> <p>6) As noted above, a definition for woodlands will be added to Section 10.2.2 based on the definition in the Region of York Official Plan. Furthermore, a policy is added that permits development in a woodland if certain conditions are met regarding the</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>quality of the woodland, as follows: That notwithstanding Policy 3.3.3.1 to Policy 3.3.3.3, development and site alteration may be permitted in a woodland if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the woodland is not a significant woodland as defined in the Region of York Official Plan or in the Provincial Policy Statement; - the woodland does not contain other natural features for which it has been defined as a Core Feature; - the woodland is a cultural community (A cultural community unit (code of CU) in accordance with the Ministry of Natural Resource Field Guide for Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario. These vegetation communities originate from, or are maintained by, anthropogenic influences and culturally based disturbances and often contain a large proportion of non-native species.) - the woodland is not connected to other parts of the Natural Heritage Network and is more than 120 m away from other parts of the Natural Heritage Network; and - woodland compensation is identified to the satisfaction of the City and in consultation with other appropriate agencies, such as TRCA and Region of 	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>York, that provides ecological gains to the Natural Heritage Network.</p>	
<p>114</p>	<p>DATE: June 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Parcels of land extending north from Highway 407 to Langstaff Road and from Highway 427 and its future extension west to Highway 50</p>	<p>1) Concerned that land use policies for employment lands in the draft OP are more restrictive than existing applicable policies.</p> <p>2) Request that Commercial Mixed-use designation along Highway 7 corridor not be applied at expense of existing policies and permissions under OPA 450, OPA 660, and any other applicable provisions.</p> <p>3) Request that any change in land use boundaries and land use policies recognize existing permissions.</p>	<p>1) Once the Official Plan receives final approval, the subject lands will have legal non-complying status. As such, the permissions of the current Zoning By-law 1-88 will apply to the lands until such time as a new By-law applicable to these lands is approved and in full force and effect.</p> <p>2) The Employment area policies in the Official Plan also reflect the Regional and Provincial employment area policies.</p> <p>3) It is proposed that a policy be added to the Official Plan to recognized existing land uses.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) Refer to Recommendation 2) under Item 25.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
115	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) A concern is raised that Section 3.2.1 includes a general comment regarding wetlands.</p> <p>2) Section 3.2.2 comment regarding the most detailed and up-to-date information available to delineate the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>3) A concern is raised regarding Section 3.2.3 and the delineation of Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>4) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.3.2 (incorrectly noted as 3.2.1.2 on Page 56 of the OP document) hands over control to the TRCA and the Province.</p> <p>6) A concern is raised about the delineation and policies regarding Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>7) A concern is raised about inconsistent use of the term "adjacent" with respect to the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>9) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.4.10 f) adds requirements for water quality and quantity beyond Ministry of Environment standards.</p> <p>10) A concern is raised about potential</p>	<p>The letter does not reference the lands to which it applies; therefore, Staff requires more information on the context in order to provide a response. A letter has been forwarded to KLM requesting that they indicate who they are representing and what their concerns are.</p> <p>Staff met with the consultant KLM Planning and discussed the substantive issues and have taken the detailed comments under consideration.</p>	<p>1) to 20) No further action is recommended on this particular list of issues, however, some of these points will have been addressed under other Items in this summary.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>additional costs of peer review of the MESP studies as suggested in Policy 3.2.4.11.</p> <p>11) A question is posed at what stage in the development process are the precise limits of valleylands delineated with respect to Policy 3.3.1.2.</p> <p>12) A concern is raised that Policy 3.3.1.5 would entrench “any and all policies of the MNR and TRCA”.</p> <p>13) There is a concern that all wetlands would be protected according to policies in Section 3.3.2.</p> <p>14) There is a concern that Policy 3.3.3.2 a) would require the precise limits of woodland to be defined on a separate property even if an application for development is on a different property.</p> <p>15) A concern is raised about maintaining pre-development infiltration rates as written in Policy 3.3.5.1(b).</p> <p>16) A point is raised that mass grading is more energy efficient and reduces greenhouse gases.</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>17) It is noted that Policy 3.7.2.6 refers to MNR standards.</p> <p>18) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.11 that pre-development infiltration rates cannot be maintained as a result of typical soils in Vaughan.</p> <p>19) It is noted that the term "adjacent" is italicized in Policy 3.7.2.19 as if to denote adjacent lands as described in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual and the PPS.</p> <p>20) A concern is raised regarding the difficulty of maintaining pre-development rates of infiltration as expressed in Policy 3.2.7.28.</p>		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
116	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 34 (Bounded by Jane Street, Teston Road, Highway 400, and Kirby Road)</p>	<p>1) A concern is raised regarding Policy 9.2.2.9 (d) and Policy 9.2.2.10 (e) that separation distances from industrial uses do not apply to all adjacent land uses. MOE distance separation guidelines deal only with the separation between employment uses and sensitive land uses and not all land uses.</p> <p>2) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1. Provision needs to be made for the re-adoption of all Council adopted and approved secondary Plans within existing designated urban areas in the City. The Plan as currently structured in Volume II does not achieve this.</p> <p>3) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1.1.5 to 10.1.1.15 Block Plans.</p> <p>OPA 600 has mechanisms in place to allow draft plans to be approved in cases where Council had not approved a Block Plan. The new OP needs to incorporate similar policies to OPA 600 (10.2.ix,a),b),c).</p> <p>4) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1.2.28. "... the owner seeking to subdivide land may be required to satisfy certain conditions prior to approval of a Plan of</p>	<p>1) Appendix C of the D-6-3 Separation Distances manual (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/3272e03.pdf) refers only to distances between Class I, II and III industrial uses and "Sensitive Land Uses". Accordingly, it is appropriate to modify Policy 9.2.2.9 (d) and 9.2.2.10 (e) to reflect that distance separation between employment uses and "Sensitive Land Uses".</p> <p>2) Volume I will supersede all existing Official Plans save and except for those identified in Volume 2. It is not the intent to retain all existing official plan amendments.</p> <p>3) Staff concur with the request, Council had not approved a Block Plan. The new OP should incorporate policies similar to OPA 600.</p> <p>4) These types of conditions are typical of draft plan approval required to be satisfied prior to final approval.</p> <p>5) The process does allow flexibility in that subdivision applications can be reviewed and processed while the Block Plan is being finalized. The intent of the policy is to prevent Block Plan conditions</p>	<p>1) Policy 9.2.2.9 (d) and 9.2.2.10 (e) will be modified as follows: "Separation distance guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Environment, or alternative measures shall be applied to achieve compatibility between uses in the General Employment designation and adjacent sensitive land uses."</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) Policies similar to OPA 600 - Development Process/Block Plans Sec. 10.2.ix, a,b,c. as outlined below be incorporated into the City's draft Official Plan.</p> <p>"Section:10.2. ix a. Subject to subsections b) and c) herein, any parcel of land within a Block Plan intended for development that is subject to a draft plan of subdivision or other development approval application must be in conformity with this Plan and consistent with an approved Block Plan; b. Where Council has not approved a Block Plan, a proposed plan of subdivision may be draft approved or other development approval granted once the proponent has completed all work required to formulate a Block Plan</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Subdivision..." These conditions are typically draft conditions of draft plan approval required to be satisfied prior to registration.</p> <p>5) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1.2.29, which states that "...that conditions of Secondary Plan and/or Block Plan shall be satisfied prior to the approval of the Plan of Subdivision. This does not provide flexibility in process.</p> <p>6) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1.3.5, which requires the cost of peer reviews of studies submitted. It is suggested that the City pay for peer review as sufficient funds are received by City to cover the cost of peer review.</p> <p>7) Regarding Policies 4.2.1.9, 4.2.1.12, 4.2.1.17 it is suggested to secure 400 series Highways, crossings and grade separations provide City and Regional benefits funding, which should be secured through development charges and/or general tax revenues, rather than through the development process.</p> <p>8) Regarding Policy 4.2.1.20 a concern is raised that it may not be practical to provide two collector roads in north/south, and east/west directions.</p>	<p>from being satisfied through the subdivision process, which is not appropriate.</p> <p>6) Staff disagrees with comment; this is typically how peer reviews are handled. For example, this is consistent with the City's peer review practices respecting Phase I Environmental Assessments which are peer reviewed at the expense of the applicant.</p> <p>7) This matter can be reviewed when the Development Charges review is undertaken.</p> <p>8) The issue will be resolved during the Secondary Plan and Block Plan process.</p> <p>9) It is not the intent of the City to maintain all existing official plan policies. Only those policies in Volume 2 will be maintained because they are recent amendments, reflect O.M.B. decisions or are consistent with the new Official Plan.</p> <p>10) The urban structure has been reviewed, which contemplates limited office use in Employment areas. These office uses are more appropriately located in the VMC and Intensification Corridors. The proposed policies will</p>	<p>in accordance with and in conformity to the provisions of this Plan, so that the proposed plan of subdivision or other development approval application may be evaluated in the context of the proposed Block Plan;</p> <p>c. A proposed plan of subdivision or other development approval application which is not consistent with a Block Plan approved by Council may receive approval provided it can be demonstrated that any deviations from the Block Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. represents an improvement; ii. are appropriate; iii. represents good planning; and, iv. conforms to the policies of this Plan." <p>4) The policy should be modified to reflect "prior to final approval"</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>And it is suggested to provide the collector roads where feasible.</p> <p>9) Raised concern respecting Policy 5.1.2.3 c., existing permissions in place in existing employment areas appear to be eliminated. This would appear to make significant tracts of existing development in Vaughan non-conforming. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>10) Raised concern respecting Policy 5.2.2, that directs major office development to the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC). Concerned about the policy restriction respecting the size of office space in Employment Areas.</p> <p>11) A concern is raised that Section 3.2.1 includes a general comment regarding wetlands.</p> <p>12) There is a comment regarding Section 3.2.2 questioning the most detailed and up-to-date information available to delineate the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>13) Section 3.2.3. There is a concern regarding the delineation of Enhancement Areas and a suggestion to</p>	<p>protect the City's Employment lands from non-employment uses.</p> <p>11) This section includes a general statement about ecosystem services provided by types of habitat.</p> <p>12) The comment is noted, but no change is necessary to the text.</p> <p>13) The proponent can review the background study, Natural Heritage in the City, for the basis of delineating the Enhancement Areas. Corridors and linkages are not necessarily only for wildlife movement, but also for population dispersal and linkages can be delineated for the appropriate ecological function.</p> <p>The Natural Heritage Network mapping does not need to change based on the comment. Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B.</p> <p>14) Using the term "in accordance with criteria provided by the Toronto and</p>	<p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p> <p>12) No change is recommended.</p> <p>13) Refer to Item 19B for details for revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>14) No change is recommended.</p> <p>15) Refer to Item 19B for details for revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>16) The recommended changes will be made to italicize the term "adjacent" when used in the context of the definition in Chapter 10.</p> <p>17) No change is recommended.</p> <p>18) Refer to Comment 27 under Item 133B.</p> <p>19) No change is recommended.</p> <p>20) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>delete the Enhancement Areas from the urban area.</p> <p>14) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.3.2 (incorrectly noted as 3.2.1.2 on Page 56 of the OP document) hands over control to the TRCA and the Province.</p> <p>15) A concern is raised about the area delineation and policies regarding Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>16) A concern is raised about inconsistent use of the term "adjacent" with respect to the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>17) A concern is raised about the need for studies on "adjacent lands" within 120 metres of the Natural Heritage Network that may be outside of a Block Plan study area.</p> <p>18) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.4.10 f) adds requirements for water quality and quantity beyond Ministry of Environment standards.</p> <p>19) A concern is raised about potential additional costs of peer review of the MESP studies as suggested in Policy</p>	<p>Region Conservation Authority and the Province" is appropriate as these agencies have regulatory authority and provide guidance and criteria to interpret policy.</p> <p>15) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B.</p> <p>16) The relevant policies will be reviewed to use the term "adjacent" in a consistent manner as defined in Chapter 10.</p> <p>17) This issue can be addressed during the MESP process when determining the scope and Terms of Reference for the required studies.</p> <p>18) Policy 2.3.33 in the Region of York Official Plan places the responsibility on the Region, local municipalities and conservation authorities for addressing long-term cumulative impact of development. Policy 3.2.4.10 f) will be deleted and Policy 3.7.2.31 will be modified to include a note about collaboration among the City, Region</p>	<p>21) No change is recommended.</p> <p>22) Policy 3.3.3.2 to be changed as follows: "That no application for development or site alteration on lands abutting or adjacent to woodlands will be considered unless: a. the precise limits of any woodland within the area of the application have been established to the satisfaction of the City."</p> <p>23) Policy 3.3.5.1 (b) to be changed as follows: "To protect aquatic biodiversity by: a. prohibiting development and site alteration in areas identified as fish habitat; b. preserving or remediating natural variation in stream flows to maintain healthy aquatic systems ensuring any permitted development maintains pre-development water balance and groundwater direction."</p> <p>24) No change is recommended.</p> <p>25) Policy 3.7.2.6 be amended to delete reference to the MNR.</p> <p>26) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>3.2.4.11.</p> <p>20) A concern is raised that Policy 3.3.1.5 would entrench “any and all policies of the MNR and TRCA”.</p> <p>21) There is a concern that policies in Section 3.3.2 protect all wetlands.</p> <p>22) There is a concern that Policy 3.3.3.2 a) would require the precise limits of woodland to be defined on a separate property even if an application for development is on a different property.</p> <p>23) A concern is raised about maintaining pre-development infiltration rates as written in Policy 3.3.5.1 b).</p> <p>24) A point is raised that mass grading is more energy efficient and reduces greenhouse gases.</p> <p>25) It is noted that Policy 3.7.2.6 erroneously refers to MNR standards.</p> <p>26) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.11 that pre-development infiltration rates cannot be maintained as a result of typical soils in Vaughan</p>	<p>and TRCA to address cumulative effects of downstream impacts. Refer to Comment 27 under Item 133B.</p> <p>19) The policy as written acts as an incentive to undertake comprehensive and integrated MESP studies so as to reduce the need for peer review.</p> <p>20) The language of the policy is to “support ongoing efforts” of these agencies.</p> <p>21) The intent of the policy is to protect any area evaluated as a wetland according to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System.</p> <p>22) The intent of the adjacent lands is to ensure no negative impacts of development on the natural feature of interest. This can be evaluated even if the precise limits of the woodland on a separate property are not established. Accept the recommendation that the precise limits of the woodland within the area of the application needs to be established.</p> <p>23) Maintaining pre- to post water balance is a standard requirement of development applications. The policy</p>	<p>27) Policy 3.7.2.21 will be modified to remove the reference to MNR.</p> <p>28) Policy 3.7.2.28 is changed as follows: "That all development will undertake stormwater management on a volume control basis that maintains recharge rates, flow paths and water quality to the extent possible, in addition to peak flow control, and to maintain pre-development water balance. Particular emphasis will be placed on areas confirmed as significant recharge area."</p> <p>29) Policy 3.7.2.29 be deleted.</p> <p>30) No change is recommended.</p> <p>31) No change is recommended.</p> <p>Shaeffers</p> <p>1a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4a) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>27) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.21 that MNR is not involved in preliminary or final design of stormwater facilities.</p> <p>28) A concern is raised regarding the difficulty of maintaining pre-development rates of infiltration as expressed in Policy 3.2.7.28.</p> <p>29) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.29 and the note about stormwater ponds discharging directly to Core Features.</p> <p>30) Policies 1.6 and 1.7- Comment with respect to timing between Volume 1 and Volume 2.</p> <p>31) Policy 2.1.3.1- Concern raised that this policy would limit any opportunity for amendment to address changing conditions.</p> <p>Shaeffer (Attachment to letter)</p> <p>1a) Policy 3.2.4.9. A concern is raised about the use of the term "rigorous" with respect to the analysis conducted as part of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan.</p>	<p>can be revised to address water balance more generally rather than specifically to infiltration rates. However, watershed plans for the Don River and Humber River emphasize the need to maintain stream base flows as a key component of watershed health.</p> <p>24) It is the intent of Policy 3.5.1.2 c) to "minimize mass grading". No specific metrics or standards are recommended by the proponent.</p> <p>25) It is agreed that, while the Province may provide standards and/or guidelines for interpretation in policies and by-laws, consultation with the MNR is not required. It is agreed to delete reference to MNR in Policy 3.7.2.6.</p> <p>26) This policy refers to "significant groundwater infiltration functions" and is also consistent with Policy 2.3.5 of the Region of York Official Plan.</p> <p>27) Staff concur with this comment.</p> <p>28) It is recommended to change the text of Policy 3.7.2.28 to maintain water balance consistent with Policy 2.3.2 of the Region of York OP.</p>	<p>5a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7a) Policy 3.7.2.9 to be changed as follows: "That low-impact development techniques, as described in TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010), will be established, where appropriate, for all new Block Plans, or Site Plans for large development sites, in order to protect groundwater resources and aquatic habitat and ensure that overall groundwater flow patterns are not impaired. The Master Environment and Servicing Plans shall reflect these best practices."</p> <p>8a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10a) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11a) Refer to Comment 28 under Item 116.</p> <p>12a) Delete Policy 3.7.2.29.</p> <p>13a) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>2a) Policy 3.2.4.10. It is noted that the City cannot bind any future document to the policies of the Official Plan in reference to an updated Environmental Management Guide to be developed soon after the adoption of the Official Plan.</p> <p>3a) Policy 3.4.2.11 regarding a peer review for MESP is considered "double dipping."</p> <p>4a) It is suggested that Policies 3.5.1.1 to 3.5.1.3 regarding landform conservation only apply to the Oak Ridges Moraine.</p> <p>5a) It is noted that Policy 3.6.2.3 may prohibit stormwater ponds from valley and stream corridors.</p> <p>6a) It is suggested that a monitoring program to ensure the effectiveness of erosion and sediment control as expressed in Policy 3.7.2.7 is not required beyond current accepted construction practices.</p> <p>7a) It is noted that the 1994 Environmental Management Guide (EMG) does not contain references to low-impact development (LID)</p>	<p>29) Policy 3.7.2.29 will be deleted as aspects of the policy are covered elsewhere.</p> <p>30) Comment noted.</p> <p>31) When the plan is updated the policies will change. In the interim, all amendments will be considered in the context of the policies of this plan.</p> <p>Shaeffers</p> <p>1a) The term "rigorous" is intended to promote an appropriate and defensible evaluation of options. The term "professional" as suggested in the comment has little meaning unless it is noted that the analysis is completed by qualified professionals.</p> <p>2a) The Official Plan includes policies regarding the submission of Environmental Impact Statements and a Master Environment and Servicing Plan. The Environmental Management Guide (EMG) will provide a range of issues related to ecological function, natural features and the maintenance of the Natural Heritage Network. The EMG will be consulted in determining the required scope and detail of studies and to</p>	<p>Savanta</p> <p>1b) Refer to Recommendation under 19B.</p> <p>2b) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3b) A policy will be added as follows: "That notwithstanding Policy 3.3.3.1 to Policy 3.3.3.3, development and site alteration may be permitted in a woodland if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the woodland is not a significant woodland as defined in the Region of York Official Plan or in the Provincial Policy Statement; - the woodland does not contain other natural features for which it has been defined as a Core Feature; - the woodland is a cultural community (A cultural community unit (code of CU) in accordance with the Ministry of Natural Resource Field Guide for Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario. These vegetation communities originate from, or are maintained by, anthropogenic influences and culturally based disturbances and

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>techniques, yet LID is noted in Policy 3.7.2.9 with reference to the EMG.</p> <p>8a) With regard to low-impact techniques referenced in Policy 3.7.2.17, the comment is raised that stormwater management facilities do not need to be sized as Level 1 facilities if part of a treatment train system.</p> <p>9a) A suggestion is made to change the text of Policy 3.7.2.18 to allow stormwater facilities below the top of bank.</p> <p>10a) The concern about the validity of the Environmental Management Guide is raised in reference to Policy 3.7.2.21.</p> <p>11a) A concern is raised regarding the difficulty of maintaining pre-development rates of infiltration as expressed in Policy 3.2.7.28.</p> <p>12a) Suggestions to alter the text of Policy 3.7.2.29 are provided with respect to prohibiting direct discharge of stormwater from development areas into Core Features.</p> <p>13a) It is suggested that a drainage channel in the northwest quadrant of</p>	<p>evaluate the thoroughness of completed evaluations and studies.</p> <p>3a) The policy as written acts as an incentive to undertake comprehensive and integrated MESP studies so as to reduce the need for peer review.</p> <p>4a) Landform conservation in the Oak Ridges Moraine is addressed in Policies 3.4.1.57 to 3.4.1.60.</p> <p>5a) Policy 3.7.2.18 directs new stormwater facilities outside of the valley and stream corridors unless approved by the City and the TRCA.</p> <p>6a) The letter does not make reference to particular regulations, only to "current accepted construction practices". This is insufficient evidence to alter a policy.</p> <p>7a) LID measures will not be described in the revised EMG, but will be recognized as areas of evaluation for stormwater management and runoff control. References to TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010) will be made to refer to LID techniques.</p>	<p>often contain a large proportion of non-native species.)</p> <p>- the woodland is not connected to other parts of the Natural Heritage Network and is more than 120 m away from other parts of the Natural Heritage Network; and</p> <p>- woodland compensation is identified to the satisfaction of the City and other appropriate agencies, such as TRCA and Region of York, that provides ecological gains to the Natural Heritage Network."</p> <p>4b) Refer to Recommendation under 19B.</p> <p>5b) Wetland and woodland definitions are as follows: "Wetlands</p> <p>Lands that are seasonally or permanently covered by shallow water, as well as lands where the water table is close to or at the surface. In either case the presence of abundant water has caused the formation of hydric soils and has favoured the dominance of either hydrophytic plants or water tolerant plants. The four major types of wetlands</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Block 27 that is mapped as a Core Feature should be removed. A photograph is provided as evidence.</p> <p>Savanta (Attachment to letter)</p> <p>1b) A recommendation is made to allow some refinement to Core Features based on site-specific conditions.</p> <p>2b) A concern is raised, likely with respect to Policy 3.2.3.4 (b), about the requirement for a 30 m ecological buffer for all wetlands.</p> <p>3b) It is recommended to be able to eliminate woodland features of poor quality.</p> <p>4b) The rationale for Enhancement Areas is questioned as the policies are as restrictive as for Core Features.</p> <p>5b) A concern is raised about the lack of definitions for such terms as "woodland", "wetland" and "Core Feature".</p> <p>6b) Questions are raised regarding the classification of select watercourses as cold, cool or warm water streams and the identification of Sensitive Fish Areas in the Natural Heritage in the City</p>	<p>8a) LID measures provide enhanced water quality performance, but may not adequately address water quantity to provincial standards. It is suggested to keep the wording of Policy 3.7.2.17 that refers to the Province's Ministry of Environment Stormwater Management Practices Planning and Design Manual.</p> <p>9a) Policy 3.7.2.18 does recognize some flexibility with regard to the location of stormwater ponds, but is not overly prescriptive. No compelling reason is provided to alter the text to be more prescriptive.</p> <p>10a) The Environmental Management Guide (EMG) will provide a range of issues related to ecological function, natural features and the maintenance of the Natural Heritage Network. The EMG will be consulted in determining the required scope and detail of studies and to evaluate the thoroughness of completed evaluations and studies.</p> <p>11a) Policy 2.3.2 of the Region of York Official Plan addresses water balance rather than outlining specific components of water balance. The text of Policy 3.2.7.28 will be modified accordingly. Refer to Comment 28 under Item 116.</p>	<p>are swamps, marshes, bogs and fens. Periodically soaked or wet lands being used for agricultural purposes which no longer exhibit wetland characteristics are not considered to be wetlands for the purposes of this definition.</p> <p>Wetlands on the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt include any wetlands identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources or by any other person, according to evaluation procedures established by the Ministry of Natural Resources, as amended from time to time.</p> <p>Woodlands A treed area of land at least 0.2 hectare in size with at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 1000 trees of any size, per hectare; b. 750 trees measuring over 5 centimetres diameter at breast height, per hectare; c. 500 trees measuring over 12 centimetres diameter at breast height, per hectare; or, d. 250 trees measuring over 20 centimetres diameter at breast height,

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>environmental background report.</p> <p>7b) Clarity is requested on the ability to modify boundaries of the Natural Heritage Network.</p>	<p>12a) Policy 3.7.2.29 will be deleted as aspects of the policy are covered elsewhere.</p> <p>13a) All drainage features and stream corridors are identified as Core Features. Core Features policies provide for minor modification of Core Features. Refer to Item 19B.</p> <p>Savanta</p> <p>1b) Select Policies regarding Core Features will be modified and/or added to allow minor modification to Core Feature boundaries based on appropriate evaluations. Refer to Item 19B.</p> <p>2b) The issue of importance is to establish whether an aquatic feature is a wetland according to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. If so, the 30m buffer applies as the evaluation has confirmed that the feature is a wetland.</p> <p>3b) Region of York Official Plan Policy 2.2.44 provides for this flexibility if certain conditions are met. A policy will be added to identify circumstances where small, isolated woodlands of poor</p>	<p>per hectare, but does not include a cultivated fruit or nut orchard, a plantation established for the purpose of producing Christmas trees or nursery stock. For the purposes of defining a woodland, treed areas separated by more than 20 metres will be considered a separate woodland."</p> <p>6b) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7b) Refer to Recommendation under Item 19B..</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>quality can be removed based on Policy 2.2.44 of the Region of York Official Plan.</p> <p>4b) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B.</p> <p>5b) Wetland and woodland definitions, based on those in the Region of York Official Plan, will be added to section 10.2.2. Core Feature and Enhancement Area definitions are provided in the text and do not need to be duplicated in the Glossary.</p> <p>6b) The questions highlight the importance of conducting a headwaters stream evaluation for parts of Vaughan, particularly areas north of Kirby Road. Green Directions Vaughan, the City's community sustainability plan, includes two Action Items that address further studies for natural areas and other environmentally sensitive lands. Action Item 1.3.2 specifically addresses aquatic features such as headwaters, riparian areas and wetlands. Action Item 2.2.4 identifies the need to develop an</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>inventory of natural heritage areas.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.1.2 recognizes the need for ongoing evaluation of the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>7b) Select Policies regarding Core Features will be modified and/or added to allow minor modification to Core Feature boundaries based on appropriate evaluations. Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B for details of revised Core Features and Enhancement Areas policies.</p>	
117	<p>DATE: May 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Grzegors Szajner</p> <p>LOCATION: South side of Major Mackenzie Drive west of Highway 400</p>	<p>Schedule 13, Schedule 13A-T Comments there is inconsistency between Schedules and actual use. Request information on designation change.</p>	<p>The south side of Major Mackenzie Drive referred to by the respondent is subject to Registered Plans of Subdivision 65M-3626 and 65M-3560. There is a noted mapping error with respect to the parcel designated Low-Rise Residential in the Official Plan on the lands located between Vellore Woods Blvd. and Starling Blvd. There is also an error with respect to the boundary between the designation on this block, and that of the adjacent easterly block.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13 and 13-N be amended to change the designation on the lands located on the south side of Major Mackenzie Drive between Starling Blvd. and Vellore Woods Blvd. from Low-Rise Residential to Low-Rise Mixed-Use. The designations at the southwest corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Hwy. 400 are appropriate and should remain unchanged.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
118	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Malone Given Parsons Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Within Block 27 and Block 41</p>	<p>1) Concern that the urban boundary is not identified on a Schedule and the consequences of not doing so.</p> <p>2) It is recommended that Natural Areas and Countryside not be amalgamated into one designation.</p> <p>3) It is suggested that there is no technical rationale for the designation of many of the Core Features of the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>4) There is a reference in the letter to a 30m setback from natural features.</p> <p>5) A concern is raised that Enhancement Area policies restrict development in the same way as Core Feature policies.</p> <p>6) There is a concern regarding Policy 3.2.3.4 (b) about establishing a 30 m buffer from all wetlands.</p> <p>7) A concern is raised that policies in Section 3.3.3 protect all woodlands without regard to habitat condition.</p> <p>8) There is a concern about the reference to natural cover targets.</p> <p>9) There are suggestions regarding</p>	<p>1) Staff agree and the urban boundary will be identified in Schedule 1.</p> <p>2) These designations are appropriately distinguished in Schedule 13.</p> <p>3) The Core Features comprise only about 20% of Vaughan and include natural features as defined in Section 2 of the Provincial Policy Statement. The authors are referred to the background study, Natural Heritage in the City.</p> <p>4) The City cannot adequately respond to the comment without specific reference to Policies in the Official Plan. In general, the Official Plan refers to minimum 10 m and 30 m setbacks as supported by Region of York and Provincial policies (e.g. Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan).</p> <p>5) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize that development is permitted on all or part of the Enhancement Area subject to further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>6) The issue of importance is to establish</p>	<p>1) Amend Schedule 1 to delineate the City's urban boundary.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) Refer to Recommendation in Item 19B.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) Refer to Recommendation under Item 133B.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) Recommend deleting Policy 3.7.2.29.</p> <p>11) Refer to Item 133B and 19B for policy revisions to allow modifications to types of Core Features.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>stormwater management to allow stormwater ponds below the top of bank.</p> <p>10) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.29 and the note about stormwater ponds discharging directly to Core Features.</p> <p>11) A question is raised about all watercourses and certain terrestrial vegetation types included within Core Features.</p>	<p>whether an aquatic feature is a wetland according to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. If so, the 30 m buffer applies as the evaluation has confirmed that the feature is a wetland.</p> <p>7) The Region of York Official Plan does allow for protection of locally significant woodlands, not just regionally significant woodlands. A policy will be added to address allowing development and site alteration in woodlands under certain conditions.</p> <p>8) These targets are used as a reference in the background study and are not in policy.</p> <p>9) There are suggestions regarding stormwater management to allow stormwater ponds below the top of bank. No change is required as Policy 3.7.2.18 does recognize some flexibility with regard to the location of stormwater ponds.</p> <p>10) Aspects of this policy are covered in other policies and it is recommended that the policy be deleted.</p> <p>11) Policy 3.3.1.4 addresses modifications to minor watercourses. A</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>policy should be added to allow development and site alteration in woodlands subject to meeting certain conditions.</p>	
<p>119</p>	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 770 Chabad Gate</p>	<p>1)Request full recognition for Synagogue and community centre in new OP, site specific policy.</p> <p>2) Request site specific provision in amending zoning by-law to permit a place of worship and community centre.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
120	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC)</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Request that language in draft OP is consistent with Provincial Policy Statement.</p>	<p>The Ontario Real Estate Corporation (ORC) Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) have requested a number of changes to the draft Official Plan to ensure the protection of Hydro Corridor lands for their primary intended use for the transmission and distribution of electricity. Seven amendments to the new Official Plan have been identified. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Use of standard language for describing infrastructure and facilities, i.e. "electricity transmission and distribution facilities"; 2) Deletion of a provision prohibiting electrical substations from "Hazard Lands", if approved by an Environmental Assessment (S. 3.6.1.7 and S. 3.6.3.3); 3) Recognition of the "transmission and distribution of electricity" as the primary corridor use when considering secondary uses (S. 8.1.2); 4) Recognition of the ORC/HONI approval processes when secondary uses are considered (S.8.1.2.5); 5) Clarify permitted uses and listing of permitted secondary uses (S.9.2.1.9); 	<p>That the proposed amendments to the plan should be incorporated into the final draft of the plan.</p> <p>USI to revise as per letter.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>6) Provide for additional secondary uses related to the main uses on adjacent lands subject to the review of the utility provider (S. 9.2.1.19);</p> <p>7) Provide for a definition of a "Public Utility" (S. 10.2.2).</p> <p>The proposed changes are acceptable subject to the final confirmation of wording, location and section numbers.</p>	
121	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest quadrant of Highway 7 and Highway 27</p>	<p>The subject lands are located in the northwest quadrant of Highway 7 and Highway 27.</p> <p>The respondent is of the position that OPA No. 450 should continue to apply to the subject lands subject to adjustments to allow for additional commercial land use permissions and intensification in key locations. Issues include: A reduced range of permitted uses in the Prestige Area designation including restrictions on the amount of office space; the creation of a 100m wide Prestige Employment strip along arterial roads; and the requirement for green</p>	<p>The Prestige Area designation (OPA 450) along Highway 7 has been replaced by a "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation to reflect its role as a "Primary Intensification Corridor", consistent with the Regional Official Plan, which expands the range of permissions, including office (up to 12,500 sq. m.) and retail. This corridor will be expanded to 200m deep to correspond with the prevailing lot depths and existing Highway 7 Secondary Plans;</p> <p>A Prestige Area designation adjacent to arterial roads and 400-series highways was provided in OPA 450. This is being</p>	<p>That Schedule 13 and 13-P be amended to extend the "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation to Highway 27 and on the north side of Highway 7 for a depth of 200m.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>roofs, rooftop amenity areas and/or the location of energy systems (solar panels) on roofs.</p>	<p>continued. Volume 1 does not require green roofs/rooftop amenity areas and solar panels. It provides for the exploration of development standards, which will address the provision of such features, where appropriate. Schedule 13 and Schedule "13P" should be amended to extend the "Commercial Mix-Use" designation to Highway 27 on the north side of Highway 7 and it will be deepened to 200m.</p> <p>The policies for this area are consistent with the Regional Official Plan and implement the Volume 1 Plan as it respects urban structure and intensification, the retail and office use hierarchy. Therefore, no other changes are recommended.</p>	
<p>122</p>	<p>DATE: May 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Request to be Notified of future Meetings</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>Respondent's name has been added to the notification list.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
123	<p>DATE: May 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Weston Road between Rutherford Road and Langstaff Road</p>	<p>The client is not in agreement with the land use schedule and policies related to the subject lands. Requests that the subject land be designated to accommodate mixed-uses (residential and commercial).</p>	<p>The subject lands have been recommended for inclusion on Schedule 14 for the purposes of undertaking a Secondary Plan Study for these and surrounding lands.</p>	<p>That Schedule 14 be amended to extend the required Secondary Plan Area #3 to encompass the area bounded by Rutherford Road and Weston Roads, Highway 400 and Bass Pro Mills Drive.</p>
124	<p>DATE: June 10, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 8151 Highway 50</p>	<p>Request site-specific policy to recognize prior approvals.</p>	<p>The subject lands are currently designated "Prestige Area" along Regional Road 50 and "Employment Area" in the interior by OPA No. 450. Consistent with the Huntington Business Park Block Plan.</p> <p>The lands are currently zoned C6 Highway Commercial, subject to Exception 9(394) and A Agricultural by By-law 1-88.</p> <p>On June 1, 2010, File: Z.07.041 (1693143 and 169144 Ontario Inc.), was considered by Council and adopted without amendment. Council recommended approval of rezoning the subject lands from C6 Highway Commercial and A Agricultural to EM2</p>	<p>Recommend that Schedules 13 and 13-P be amended to reflect the designations shown on OPA No.450 as refined by the Huntington Business Park Block Plan with the exceptions of the designations proposed for Highway No.7 and the Northwest corner of Highway No.427 and 407.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>General Employment Zone and EM3 Retail Warehouse Zone.</p> <p>On June 29, 2010, By-law 171-2010 was enacted by Council.</p> <p>The Official Plan will no longer permit retail warehousing in employment lands. No changes are recommended to the policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Currently these lands have Council approvals on the site respecting the Zoning Amendment Application, and will have a revised Zoning By-law in place, once it is in full force and effect. There is no necessity to provide site specific policies in the Official Plan. It would be appropriate to amend Schedules 13 and 13P to reflect the existing designations as shown on the Huntington Business Park Block Plan.</p>	
125	<p>DATE: May 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION:</p>	<p>Request site specific provisions so that previously approved place of worship is approved as recognized.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Southwest corner of Bathurst Street and North Park Road, north of Centre Street			
126	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Lots 16-20, Concession 9</p>	<p>1) Concern with the extent of the Natural Area designation shown on Schedule 13-L. Request work that was relied upon to determine limits.</p> <p>2) Concern with limitations on free standing space and office accessory to a permitted employment use. Recommend the accessory office space provision undergo further review.</p> <p>3) Request background material used in determining restrictions on retail use in employment area- floor area and locational restrictions.</p>	<p>1) There is a request for the work relied upon to delineate the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>2) and 3) There is a concern about "requiring environmental studies to be undertaken on lands within 120 m of identified natural features". Policy 3.2.4.3 requires an Environmental Impact Statement for applications for development within 120 m of the Natural Heritage Network. This is consistent with Policy 2.1.8 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by the Council of the Region of York in December 2009).</p>	<p>1) See the background study, Natural Heritage in the City.</p> <p>2) and 3) No change is recommended.</p>
127A	<p>DATE: May 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 24 Woodstream</p>	Request amendment to Schedule 13-P to reflect By-law 39-2009 FSI and maximum building height permissions.	The lands are shown with a maximum height and density of 8 storeys and 2.5 respectively, whereas By-law 39-2009 permits 10 stores and an FSI of 3.0. The request is considered appropriate given the surrounding land use designations and density and that the request is consistent with density and height permissions within OPA 661 and	That Schedule 13-P be amended to show a maximum building height of 10 storeys and an FSI of 3.0 for the properties municipally known as 24 Woodstream Boulevard.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Boulevard		approved in By-law 39-2009.	
127B	DATE: June 03, 2010 RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc. LOCATION: 24 Woodstream Boulevard	Request confirmation that subject property is within the Primary Intensification Corridor.	The lands are located within the Primary Intensification Corridor identified on Schedule 1.	No change is recommended.
128	DATE: June 07, 2010 RESPONDENT: Building Industry and Land Development Association LOCATION: Vaughan	1) Comments are provided on green development standards. 2) It is recommended that Natural Areas and Countryside not be amalgamated into one designation. 3) It is requested to provide more opportunity to change Core Features and Enhancement Areas. 4) A concern is raised about minimum setbacks to natural features. 5) BILD notes that they do not agree with	1) BILD will be consulted when the green build standards are developed and implemented. 2) These designations are appropriately distinguished in Schedule 13. 3) Policies will be modified to allow minor modifications of Core Features and appropriate evaluation of Enhancement Areas. 4) The setbacks articulated in Policy 3.2.3.4 are consistent with Provincial and Regional policy.	1) No change is recommended. 2) No change is recommended. 3) See Recommendation in Item 19B. 4) No change is recommended. 5) No change is recommended. 6) See Recommendation in Item 19B. 7) No change is recommended. 8) No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>mapping the Key Natural Heritage Features (KNHFs) of the Greenbelt Plan area as described in Policy 3.2.3.6.</p> <p>6) A concern is raised about the policies of Enhancement Areas and the recommendation to include development if it can be justified and result in no overall net ecological loss to the Enhancement Area.</p> <p>7) Requests removing the additional fee for peer review as expressed in Policy 3.2.4.11.</p> <p>8) BILD requests that Section 3.6.2 regarding flooding hazards and Policy 3.7.2.18 be modified to allow stormwater management ponds below the top of bank in valleylands.</p> <p>9) A comment is provided about Low Impact Development (LID) measures and reducing the size of stormwater ponds.</p>	<p>5) It is a requirement of Greenbelt Plan conformity to map KNHFs. An application within 120 m of a KNHF still requires a Natural Heritage Evaluation to determine the precise boundaries of the KNHF.</p> <p>6) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize that development is permitted on all or part of the Enhancement Area subject to further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>7) However, this policy provides an incentive to undertake adequate analysis so as to avoid the need for peer review at the discretion of the City.</p> <p>8) This request is contrary to current practice at the City of Vaughan. Policy 3.7.2.18 does recognize some flexibility with regard to the location of stormwater ponds.</p> <p>9) LID measures provide enhanced water quality performance, but may not adequately address water quantity to provincial standards. Maintain the wording of Policy 3.7.2.17 that refers to</p>	<p>9) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>the Province's Ministry of Environment Stormwater Management Practices Planning and Design Manual.</p>	
<p>129</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Zelinka Priamo Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Southwest quadrant of Highway 400 and Regional Road 7</p>	<p>1) Owners are reviewing proposed land use designations and densities.</p> <p>2) Request a policy to recognize the plan will be achieved in time and that interim development policies are required.</p> <p>3) Include wording in the OP to recognize existing uses.</p> <p>4) Requests flexibility in the proposed built form policies.</p> <p>5) The lands are subject to a Secondary Plan and clarification is requested about whether development can proceed in the</p>	<p>1) No action required.</p> <p>2) An overall objective within the draft Official Plan is to develop complete communities with compact urban form that supports transit service and promotes walking, cycling and healthy living and to identify a hierarchy of mixed-use centres to be developed in a compact form and at appropriate densities to support transit service. Interim uses are not being contemplated as they do not meet the intent of the Plan.</p> <p>3) It is the intent to add a policy to</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) Refer to Recommendation number 2) in Item 25.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		interim.	<p>Section 10 to recognize existing uses.</p> <p>4) Section 9.2.1.2 provides the requested flexibility.</p> <p>5) Section 10.1.1.14 provides that no amendments to the Official Plan or zoning By-law will be permitted without prior or concurrent adoption of the Secondary Plan.</p>	
131	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Lormel Homes</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) A question in raised about how the Enhancement Areas were identified and that the Enhancement Areas policies are too restrictive.</p> <p>2) Policies 9.2.2.13. b) vii) respecting 'transition zone' between Whitebelt and Countryside designations are vague.</p> <p>3) Policy 9.1.3.3 requires a developer to submit "Sustainable Development Report". How will it be determined if an application is "green" enough?</p> <p>4) Concern respecting Policy 9.2.2.13.xii.d requiring not more than 500 metres between 90% of the residents and transit stops in the Whitebelt.</p>	<p>1) See Page 31 of the Natural Heritage in the City report for a summary of criteria and features that comprise the Enhancement Areas. Enhancement Areas policies should be modified to recognize that development is permitted on all or part of the Enhancement Area subject to further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>2) Staff have reviewed this issue and recommend that policy 9.2.2.13 be (vii) be deleted.</p> <p>3) It is a general policy initiative to encourage a formal approach to sustainable buildings and sites in the Official Plan. Through the Development</p>	<p>1) Refer to Recommendation in Item #19B.</p> <p>2) That policy 9.2.2.13 be (vii) be deleted.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) Recommend that 9.2.2.13 b) (xiv) be amended as follows: "that any particular phase of development is substantially complete before a subsequent phase may be registered".</p> <p>6) Modify the wording of Policy 9.2.13 (b) to include after the word "process" in</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) Policy 9.2.2.13.b.xiv) requiring that 75% of phased development is built or under construction before a subsequent phase can be registered, too difficult to monitor.</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.2.13.b - Is one Secondary Plan required for both "Whitebelt" (New Community Areas) or can each New Community Area have its own Secondary Plan? Concern over coordinating the two should one secondary plan be required for both designated New Community Areas.</p> <p>7) Clarification why a 'Sub-watershed Study' is required to be prepared by TRCA, when ecological features will be studied by Consultants and approved by agencies including TRCA through the Secondary Plan and Block Plan Process.</p>	<p>Review process, the City will be implementing more detailed sustainable building initiatives that inform this policy in the future.</p> <p>4) Policy 9.2.2.13 xii requires the preparation of a mobility plan as part of a New Community Area to address a number of objectives, one of which is to have development generally no more than 500 metres for 90% of the population, and no more than 200 metres for 50% of the populations. This is a target rather than a requirement.</p> <p>5) Staff has recommended a revision to this policy to provide greater flexibility for phasing.</p> <p>6) It is important to do the Secondary Plan concurrently because there may be issues that require a shared resolution (eg. environmental, engineering). In the event that there is an impediment to one of the Blocks proceeding (eg. GTA West Corridor) it may be possible to address them separately. Recommended modification to the Policy to reflect this.</p> <p>7) The requirement for a sub-watershed study is based on the need for updated hydrological modelling to account for</p>	<p>the first sentence, "unless extenuating circumstances would dictate otherwise".</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>new urban areas. The sub-watershed study will provide guidance regarding stormwater management criteria and other ecosystem functions.</p>	
<p>133B</p>	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Comments from the TRCA are summarized as follows:</p> <p>1) TRCA comments about the City intentions regarding the Natural Heritage Network (NHN).</p> <p>2) TRCA requests that the stormwater management section include the requirement for an updated hydrologic study at a watershed scale.</p> <p>3) TRCA requests that the content of the Environmental Management Guide be adopted as part of the overall policies of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>1) The comment about the City intentions regarding the Natural Heritage Network (NHN) are not specific. Perhaps TRCA wishes to see specific targets to grow the NHN. Section 3.2.2 does includes policies for ongoing evaluation of the NHN.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.2.2.13.dii) requires the completion of sub-watershed studies in advance of considering development applications in New Community Areas.</p> <p>3) The Environmental Management Guide will be made available after the adoption of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>1) No change recommended. 2) No change recommended. 3) No change recommended. 4) The second paragraph in Section 3.2.1 on Page 51 is recommended to be modified as follows: The Natural Heritage Network defined in this Plan, and the related policies, are built on an understanding of the functions that each identified natural heritage feature performs independently and as part of a connected system. The intent is to protect the specific natural features and ensure that their functions within the overall Natural Heritage Network are maintained and enhanced.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) TRCA emphasizes protection of the natural heritage system rather than as component features.</p> <p>5) TRCA comments on the change from the term “ecosystem services” in previous drafts of the Official Plan to the use of the term “ecosystem functions”.</p> <p>6) It is noted that Section 3.2.1 includes text to allow flexibility to enhance and better link the Natural Heritage Network, but does not provide criteria or tests in this section of the Official Plan.</p> <p>7) A concern is raised that replacing the term “ecosystem services” with “ecosystem functions” downplays the role of the NHN.</p> <p>8) TRCA recommends using similar language as the Greenbelt Plan with regard to terrestrial systems and water resource systems as the basis for the Natural Heritage Network. It is also noted that the text of Chapter 3 uses language related to the system and to the features or areas.</p> <p>9) Regarding Section 3.2.2, TRCA wishes to be acknowledged for continuing the process of natural</p>	<p>4) The concern that an emphasis on protecting features does not protect the system. TRCA points to the need to modify the second paragraph of Section 3.2.1, but does not specify particular suggestions.</p> <p>5) "Ecosystem services" is not defined in policy by the Province or the Region of York. As the Province develops policy to support ecosystem services, the City of Vaughan is in a good position to reflect this policy direction.</p> <p>6) Select policies regarding Core Features will be modified to allow for minor modifications to boundaries while maintaining overall habitat area and enhancing ecosystem function.</p> <p>7) The change was made as ecosystem services does not have the same support in provincial and regional policy as ecosystem functions, which is specifically noted in the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>8) The comments are noted at this time, but are not critical to policy interpretation.</p>	<p>This approach protects the defined Natural Heritage Network while allowing flexibility in how to promote enhancement and improved connectivity to better link the Network.</p> <p>5) No change recommended.</p> <p>6) Refer to Item #19B for details of policy changes.</p> <p>7) No change recommended.</p> <p>8) No change recommended.</p> <p>9) No change recommended.</p> <p>10) A sentence will be added to the last sentence in the first paragraph of Section 3.2.3 that, “Furthermore, the PPS defines a natural heritage system to include lands that have been restored and areas with the potential to be restored to a natural state.”</p> <p>11) No change recommended.</p> <p>12) No change recommended.</p> <p>13) No change recommended.</p> <p>14) No change recommended.</p> <p>15) Refer to Item #19B for details of changes to Core Features policies.</p> <p>16) No change recommended.</p> <p>17) No change recommended.</p> <p>18) No change recommended.</p> <p>19) Refer to Item #19B.</p> <p>20) Policy 3.2.3.13 to be changed as follows: 3.2.3.13. That new development and/or site alterations on Built-up Valley Lands</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>heritage inventory analysis and leading ecological data collection.</p> <p>10) TRCA requests the inclusion of Section 3.2.3 of the OP, text from the definition of natural heritage system in the Provincial Policy Statement, namely, "these systems can include lands that have been restored and areas with the potential to be restored to a natural state."</p> <p>11) TRCA requests a policy to determine how the limits of the Natural Heritage Network will be determined in the field.</p> <p>12) A concern is raised that the Natural Heritage Network definitions are vague, but there are no specific suggestions to strengthen the descriptions.</p> <p>13) A concern is raised regarding Section 3.2.3.4 that the ecological buffer widths are not consistent.</p> <p>14) TRCA requests that the higher standards of a 30 m ecological buffer to natural features should be written into policy as supported by the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. However, the Region of York policy for regionally</p>	<p>9) The text of Section 3.2.2 that acknowledges TRCA as a partner with other agencies is sufficient.</p> <p>10) The City agrees with this recommendation as it supports the Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>11) Policy 3.2.3.2 addresses the issue of determining the precise limits of natural features.</p> <p>12) Section 3.2.3 and, in particular, Page 55, describes the components of the Natural Heritage Network (Core Features, Enhancement Areas and Built-Up Valleylands).</p> <p>13) The ecological buffers reflect Provincial policy (i.e. Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan), Region of York policy, and existing Council-adopted policy (i.e. 10m valley buffer policy at the request of TRCA).</p> <p>14) The City is consistent with provincial and regional policy.</p> <p>15) An additional policy to the Core Features policies will indicate that the "Core Features and their ecological buffers will be encouraged to be</p>	<p>are prohibited, except where a Secondary Plan or site-specific management strategy has been developed, to the satisfaction of the City and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. The Secondary Plan or management strategy must ensure that impacts on natural heritage features are minimized and that appropriate flood control measures are implemented.</p> <p>21) No change recommended.</p> <p>22) The following change will be made to the second paragraph under Section 3.2.4: "... the City has developed an Environmental Management Guide that sets out the general requirements for specific studies that must be undertaken to satisfy the environmental reporting required in this Plan." 23) Policy 3.2.4.1 to be changed as follows: "That the City of Vaughan Environmental Management Guide establishes the scope and technical requirements for the preparation of environmental reporting, to be confirmed based on area-specific issues, in support of development applications." 24) Policy 3.2.4.7 to be changed as follows:</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>significant forests includes a 10 m buffer.</p> <p>15) A concern is raised that ecological buffers should also be brought into public ownership.</p> <p>16) A question is asked why no buffers are specified for ANSIs and ESAs in Policy 3.2.3.4, but the TRCA does not offer specific suggestions.</p> <p>17) A concern is raised that the 15 m and 30 m minimum buffers for fish habitat as articulated in Policy 3.2.3.4 are outdated.</p> <p>18) It is noted that infrastructure and utilities projects, as noted in Policy 3.2.3.7c, are usually carried out through an Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>19) There is a question regarding the implementation of Policy 3.2.3.8 to prohibit any unauthorized removal or alteration of natural features in Core Features.</p> <p>20) It is recommended to replace "flood and erosion control" with the term "flood works" in Policy 3.2.3.13.</p> <p>21) It is suggested for Policy 3.2.3.14 to</p>	<p>conveyed to the City and/or TRCA as a condition of development approval".</p> <p>16) Table 1 in the ORMCP does not include specific minimum vegetation protection zones for ANSIs and ESAs as the buffers are dependent on the types of features for which the ANSIs and ESAs have been identified.</p> <p>17) The revised Natural Heritage Reference Manual (Draft 2009) includes 15 m and 30 m buffer distances as MNR's recommended minimum distances for riparian area natural vegetated cover for fish habitat.</p> <p>18) The focus of the policy should remain on the objective rather than prescriptions about the particular process.</p> <p>19) Policy 3.2.3.8 will be modified to include a statement that development applications will not proceed until restoration works have been undertaken.</p> <p>20) It is recommended to replace "flood and erosion control" with the term "flood works" in Policy 3.2.3.13.</p> <p>21) Policy 3.2.3.14 refers to Schedule 2</p>	<p>"That the study area boundaries for the Master Environment and Servicing Plan may be required to extend beyond the boundaries of the Block Plan, or development application site, in order to properly identify the existing functions and the extent of impact related to the Natural Heritage Network within the context of its watershed or sub-watershed."</p> <p>25) Policy 3.2.4.9 to be changed as follows: "That a Master Environment and Servicing Plan, to be undertaken by qualified professionals, will be conducted in a manner consistent with an ecosystem functions approach to planning,...".</p> <p>26) Policy 3.2.4.10 to be changed as follows: 3.2.4.10. That the specific requirements of the Master Environment and Servicing Plan will be outlined in the Environmental Management Guide, and at a minimum will address the following: a. an inventory of all natural heritage features and ecosystem functions on the site and on adjacent and nearby sites, including groundwater resources; b. proposed measures to improve natural heritage features and ecosystem functions;</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>note which components of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan are part of the NHN.</p> <p>22) In section 3.2.4, a minor editorial change is requested concerning the reference to the Environmental Management Guide.</p> <p>23) There is a recommendation to modify Policy 3.2.4.1 to recognize area-specific issues.</p> <p>24) There is a recommendation to modify Policy 3.2.4.7 to recognize the context of the watershed or sub-watershed.</p> <p>25) There is a recommendation to modify Policy 3.2.4.9 to specify that studies are to be undertaken by qualified professionals.</p> <p>26) It is suggested to re-order items (a) through (i) in Policy 3.2.4.10.</p> <p>27) It is suggested that a statement on cumulative effects, as noted in Policy 3.2.4.10 (f), cannot be effectively assessed at the block scale and should be assessed at the watershed scale.</p>	<p>and Schedule 4. This is sufficient to identify the components of the Natural Heritage Network in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</p> <p>22) The minor editorial change should be made concerning the reference to the Environmental Management Guide.</p> <p>23) Area-specific issues should be noted in Policy 3.2.4.1.</p> <p>24) The context of the watershed or sub-watershed should be noted in Policy 3.2.4.7.</p> <p>25) Policy 3.2.4.9 will be modified to specify that studies are to be undertaken by qualified professionals.</p> <p>26) Policy 3.2.4.10 will be modified to reflect the TRCA suggestions.</p> <p>27) Policy 3.2.4.10 (f) will be removed. Text will be added to Policy 3.7.2.31 to address the evaluation of flooding on downstream flood vulnerable areas. The policy statement will reflect the Region of York direction that cumulative effects monitoring is the responsibility of public agencies.</p>	<p>c. the limits of development;</p> <p>d. the proposed approach to development informed by the evaluation of features and functions to be maintained and/or enhanced, and additional infrastructure requirements;</p> <p>e. an assessment of impacts on natural heritage features and ecosystem functions, including cumulative impacts from development;</p> <p>f. proposed environmental management techniques and measures to mitigate anticipated impacts;</p> <p>g. an assessment of impacts on natural hazards, including cumulative impacts of development and proposed mitigation or remediation measures;</p> <p>h. recommendations for long-term management, monitoring requirements and contingency plans for the Natural Heritage Network and,</p> <p>i. a statement on overall compliance with the environmental policies of this Plan.</p> <p>27) Policy 3.7.2.31 to be changes as follows: To work with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority to monitor the effects of new development and redevelopment in urban areas on receiving watercourses and the hydrologic balance in order to apply</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>28) TRCA wishes to be consulted in determining the need and Terms of Reference for a peer review as articulated in Policy 3.2.4.11.</p> <p>29) It is requested to include a definition of "valley and stream corridor" based on the 1994 Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program.</p> <p>30) A concern is raised with respect to Policy 3.3.1.1 regarding the delineation of vegetation protection zones and situations where larger ecological buffers may be required.</p> <p>31) It is noted that public works such as roads that cross a valley and stream corridor require an Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>32) A concern is raised regarding the permission of alteration of minor watercourses as described in Policy 3.3.1.4. It is further noted that minor watercourses may, for example, provide habitat for endangered reddsides.</p> <p>33) It is noted with respect to Policy 3.3.1.5 that the TRCA is the lead agency regarding valley and stream corridors, not the MNR.</p>	<p>28) Policy 3.2.4.11 should be modified to include a reference to input from the TRCA.</p> <p>29) A definition for "valley and stream corridor", based on the 1994 Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program, will be added to Section 10.2.2 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>30) Policy 3.3.1.2 addresses the precise delineation of the valley and stream corridor to the satisfaction of the City and TRCA. A reference to appropriate ecological buffers will also be included in Policy 3.3.1.2.</p> <p>31) It is noted that public works such as roads that cross a valley and stream corridor require an Environmental Assessment. A note will be added to Policy 3.3.1.3 regarding the completion of necessary environmental assessment studies.</p> <p>32) However, this policy directs that appropriate studies be completed as part of the development approval process to the satisfaction of the City and TRCA.</p> <p>33) The policy directs to "support the ongoing efforts" and is not specific to</p>	<p>adaptive management measures as necessary to maintain water balance and evaluate flooding on downstream flood vulnerable areas.</p> <p>28) Policy 3.2.4.11 to be changed as follows: "That the Master Environment and Servicing Plan may be subject to peer review at the discretion of the City and based on input from the TRCA, the cost of which shall be borne by the affected landowners within the subject block." 29) The definition, based on the Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program (TRCA 1994) is as follows: Valley and stream corridors are the natural resources associated with river systems characterized by their landforms, features and functions. Valley and stream corridors are distinguished from other physiographic features by their connection to the river system as a whole. Valley corridors are distinguished from stream corridors by the presence of a distinct landform. 30) Policy 3.3.1.2 to be changed as follows: That no application for development or site alteration on lands abutting or adjacent to valley and stream corridors will be considered unless the precise</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>34) The comments with respect to wetlands policies (Policy 3.3.2.1 and 3.3.2.2) are noted.</p> <p>35) A question is raised for woodlands, but also more generally for other ecological features, whether policies exist to bring the features into the Natural Heritage Network (NHN) if they are identified as significant features, but not already delineated in the NHN.</p> <p>36) A concern is raised with respect to Policy 3.3.3.1 that vegetation protection zones are not directed to be placed into public ownership.</p> <p>37) It is requested that Edge Management Plans be referenced in Policy 3.3.3.1.</p> <p>38) It is noted in reference to Policy 3.3.3.4 that TRCA is working on an urban forest inventory on behalf of Vaughan.</p> <p>39) Several issues are raised regarding the distinction of protecting habitat of endangered species as may be set out in under the Endangered Species Act (2007) and significant wildlife habitat as</p>	<p>lead agencies.</p> <p>34) However, there are not specific suggestions that require a response.</p> <p>35) Policies 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.2.2 address the issue of identifying additional natural areas for inclusion in the Natural Heritage Network. .</p> <p>36) Policy 3.3.3.1 should be modified to also seek that ecological buffers be put into public ownership.</p> <p>37) It is requested that Edge Management Plans be referenced in Policy 3.3.3.1. Edge Management Plans are referenced in the Implementation section in Policy 10.1.3.3 (d).</p> <p>38) It is noted in reference to Policy 3.3.3.4 that TRCA is working on an urban forest inventory on behalf of Vaughan. The partnership noted is primarily lead by York Region. Policy 3.3.3.4 supports action items in Green Directions Vaughan, the City's community sustainability plan.</p> <p>39) Policy 3.3.4.1 should be modified to address habitat of species at risk separately from significant wildlife</p>	<p>limits of valley and stream corridors and appropriate ecological buffers have been established to the satisfaction of the City and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.</p> <p>31) Policy 3.3.1.3 is changed as follows: That those public works considered to be generally compatible for location in the valleys are those associated with flood control, erosion control, reconstruction, repair or maintenance of existing drains approved under the Drainage Act. Public works which because of their linear nature, such as roadways, must cross the valleys at some point are permitted following completion of necessary environmental assessments. Where such structures are necessary, they must be properly sited, designed and constructed with state-of-the-art erosion and sediment control measures to minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>32) No change recommended.</p> <p>33) No change recommended.</p> <p>34) No change recommended.</p> <p>35) No change recommended.</p> <p>36) Policy 3.3.3.1 (c) is changed as follows: "seeking public ownership of woodlands and their ecological buffers through the development process; and,"</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>set out in the PPS.</p> <p>40) A recommendation is provided to refer to water balance more generally rather than specific components of water balance in Policy 3.3.5.1.</p> <p>41) TRCA questions the reference to the Federal Fisheries Act in Policy 3.3.5.2.</p> <p>42) TRCA recommends that Policy 3.3.5.3 be less prescriptive about protection measures and refer instead to recommendations in the endangered species recovery plan.</p> <p>43) TRCA provides clarification for the preamble in Section 3.3.6 regarding the identification and buffers for Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs).</p> <p>44) Regarding Section 3.4.1, TRCA asks to confirm which components of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) are in the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>45) An editorial comment is provided for the text preamble in Section 3.4.1.</p>	<p>habitat. An additional policy is recommended to address the identification of significant wildlife habitat separate from endangered species.</p> <p>40) Policy 3.3.5.1 should be modified to water balance more generally rather than specific components of water balance.</p> <p>41) Policy 3.3.5.2 should be modified to refer more generally to the Fish Habitat Referral Protocol for Ontario (2009) with regard to permitting and approvals roles of various agencies.</p> <p>42) Policy 3.3.5.3 should be modified to refer to recommendations in the endangered species recovery plan.</p> <p>43) The preamble in Section 3.3.6 should be modified to reflect TRCA suggestions regarding the identification and buffers for Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs).</p> <p>44) Key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features are considered part of the Core Features of the Natural Heritage Network. This is</p>	<p>37) No change is recommended. 38) No change is recommended. 39) Policy 3.3.4.1 to be changed as follows: To protect and enhance the habitat of species at risk including endangered, threatened and special concern species by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. prohibiting development or site alteration within the habitat of endangered or threatened species, as identified on the Species at Risk in Ontario List; b. ensuring appropriate buffers from this habitat are provided as identified in provincial guidelines; c. encouraging stewardship measures to protect the habitat of species at risk; and, d. working with landowners, developers, York Region, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and other government agencies to develop management plans or recovery strategies for species at risk in Vaughan. <p>An additional policy (e.g. 3.3.4.2) is recommended as follows: To protect and enhance significant wildlife habitat by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. identifying significant wildlife habitat in accordance with criteria provided by the

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>46) Minor editing changes are recommended for Policy 3.4.1.1 and Policy 3.4.1.3.</p> <p>47) It is requested to define Home Industry and low intensity recreational uses referenced in Policy 3.4.1.7.</p> <p>48) It is noted that Policy 3.4.1.15 should list the types of key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features.</p> <p>49) It is noted to consistently use the term "hydrologically sensitive features" in Policy 3.4.1.15 and 3.4.1.17 as this is the term used in the ORMCP.</p> <p>50) Minor additions to Policy 3.4.1.17 are recommended.</p> <p>51) TRCA notes that it is the delegate for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans regarding fish habitat as referenced in Policy 3.4.18.</p> <p>52) The question is posed if specific sections of Chapter 3 should be noted in Policy 3.4.1.19 with respect to key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features that may not be shown on Schedule 2.</p>	<p>noted in Policy 3.4.1.15</p> <p>45) The text preamble in Section 3.4.1 should be modified to reflect TRCA suggestions.</p> <p>46) Policy 3.4.1.1 and Policy 3.4.1.3 should be modified to reflect TRCA suggestions.</p> <p>47) Home Industry is defined on Page 8 of the ORMCP. Low intensity recreational uses are described in Section 37 of the ORMCP.</p> <p>48) Policy 3.4.1.15 should be modified to list the types of key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features.</p> <p>49) Policy 3.4.1.15 and Policy 3.4.1.17 should be modified to consistently use the term "hydrologically sensitive features" as this is the term used in the ORMCP.</p> <p>50) Policy 3.4.1.17 should be modified to reflect TRCA suggestions.</p> <p>51) Policy 3.4.18 should be modified to note that TRCA is the delegate for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans</p>	<p>Province through the appropriate study such as a watershed plan, environmental impact statement, or natural heritage or hydrological evaluations, prior to undertaking any development or site alteration; and, b. working with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and other government agencies to identify significant wildlife habitats where there are concentrations of biodiversity.</p> <p>40) Policy 3.3.5.1 is changed to reflect the TRCA comments consistent with the Humber River Fisheries Management Plan, the Humber River Watershed Plan and the Don River Watershed Plan. Refer to Item #115 (Point #15).</p> <p>41) Policy 3.3.5.2 is changed as follows: That any development application or Block Plan prepared in support of new development will be reviewed by the City and appropriate agencies with respect to its potential impact on fish habitat to determine if it will result in a reduction of the ecological functions, attributes, or linkages of the stream which could impair aquatic health. Where adverse impacts are confirmed, authorizations will be consistent with the Fish Habitat Referral Protocol for Ontario (2009).</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>53) It is noted that Policy 3.4.1.24 should make mention of the Don River and Humber River watershed plans.</p> <p>54) A question is posed regarding the determination of aggregate resource areas.</p> <p>55) Regarding Policies 3.4.1.40 and 3.4.1.41, TRCA indicates that the Teston Road extension is not appropriate or acceptable.</p> <p>56) Regarding Policy 3.4.1.42, it is requested to insert the word "flow" after the word "groundwater".</p> <p>57) Regarding Policy 3.4.1.43 (a), it is requested to change "hydrological" to "hydrologically sensitive".</p> <p>58) Regarding Policy 3.4.1.52, it is requested to add "kettle wetland" and "Provincially significant wetland".</p> <p>59) It is suggested to modify Policy 3.4.2.3 to refer to existing Rural Residential uses.</p> <p>60) It is suggested to remove the word "net" from Policy 3.4.2.5(a).</p>	<p>regarding fish habitat.</p> <p>52) Policy 3.4.1.19 is an interpretation of Policy 10.7.1 (ix) in OPA #604. Policy 3.4.1.19 should be modified to refer to Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Official Plan rather than generally to Chapter 3.</p> <p>53) Policy 3.4.1.24 should be modified to reference the Don River and Humber River watershed plans.</p> <p>54) Schedule 5, Mineral Aggregate Resources, should reflect the Aggregate Resource Areas as shown on Map 9 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by Regional Council in December 2009).</p> <p>55) Policies 3.4.1.40 and 3.4.1.41 are taken from OPA 604, which was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on October 21, 2004.</p> <p>56) Policy 3.4.1.42 should be modified to insert the word "flow" after the word "groundwater".</p> <p>57) Policy 3.4.1.43 (a) should be modified to change "hydrological" to "hydrologically sensitive".</p>	<p>42) Policy 3.3.5.3 is changed as follows: That development and associated servicing infrastructure that has an impact on streams identified as habitat for species at risk will provide for the protection and enhancement of aquatic habitat that supports these species. Development will be required to adhere to recommendations in the endangered species recovery plan.</p> <p>43) The text preamble to Section 3.3.6 is changed as follows: Text preamble to Section 3.3.6: Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) are natural areas that have special geological or landform characteristics, hydrological or hydrogeological functions; or which support rare, threatened or endangered species; or provide high quality wildlife habitat or important habitat for a concentration of species such as migratory stop-over areas; or provide a significant linkage function. Life Science and Earth Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs) are landscapes that have provincially or regionally significant ecological and geological features, respectively. ESAs are identified by TRCA and ANSIs are identified by the Province. Vaughan will protect all ESAs and ANSIs from</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>61) It is suggested to include Total Developable Area in the glossary as it is referenced in Policy 3.2.4.6.</p> <p>62) It is suggested to modify Policy 3.4.2.7 to refer to existing Rural Residential uses.</p> <p>63) Regarding Policy 3.4.2.16, it is suggested that Vaughan cannot direct the MNR.</p> <p>64) It is requested to include reference to phasing of land clearing in relation to Policy 3.5.1.2(c) regarding landform conservation.</p> <p>65) Regarding Policy 3.6.1.1, it is suggested to remove the reference to flooding and bedrock.</p> <p>66) It is suggested regarding Policy 3.6.1.8 to specify the "stable top of bank" and that greater setbacks may be required based on geotechnical review.</p> <p>67) It is suggested to remove the reference to MNR in Policy 3.6.1.9.</p> <p>68) It is suggested that Policy 3.6.2.4 regarding directing appropriate studies</p>	<p>58) The current wording of Policy 3.4.1.52 matches that of Policy 10.17 (viii) of OPA 604, which was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on October 21, 2004, and Policy 45(7) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</p> <p>59) Policy 3.4.2.3 should be modified to refer to existing Rural Residential uses.</p> <p>60) Policy 3.4.2.5(a) should be modified to remove the word "net".</p> <p>61) The Greenbelt Plan can be consulted for a range of definitions.</p> <p>62) Policy 3.4.2.7 should be modified to refer to existing Rural Residential uses.</p> <p>63) Policy 3.4.2.16 should be modified to generally address that all aggregate operations comply with the Aggregate Resources Act and the provisions of the applicable Provincial plan.</p> <p>64) Phasing and sequencing of development is addressed elsewhere in the Official Plan.</p> <p>65) Policy 3.6.1.1 should be modified to delete the references to flooding and</p>	<p>development to preserve their unique landscape, species and habitat features.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.6.2 is changed as follows: That an application for development or site alteration on lands adjacent to ESAs and or ANSIs must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. identify planning, design and construction practices that will ensure protection of the ecological attributes for which the ESA or ANSI was identified; b. determine the appropriate minimum vegetation protection zone and specify the dimensions of that zone and provide for the maintenance and, where possible, improvement or restoration of the natural vegetation within it; and, c. assess the potential impact of the development on the ecological functions and attributes of the ESA and ANSI and provide a detailed mitigation strategy. <p>44) No change recommended.</p> <p>45) The text of Section 3.4.1 is changed as follows: The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan was developed by the Province to protect this landform. Vaughan will support the objectives of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan to ensure the effective protection of natural heritage and hydrological features and</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>for intensification in flood vulnerable areas should apply only for the Special Policy Area.</p> <p>69) It is suggested to add a policy regarding stormwater management practices that addresses baseflow, water quality, flooding hazards, ecological functions and aquatic biodiversity.</p> <p>70) Regarding Policy 3.7.2.3, it is suggested to add a reference to the TRCA's erosion and sediment control guidelines.</p> <p>71) It is suggested to refer to TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010) in Policy 3.7.2.9.</p> <p>72) It is suggested with respect to Policy 3.7.2.10 that a hydrogeological study should be a component of all Master Environment and Servicing Plans.</p> <p>73) Regarding Policy 3.7.2.14, which refers generally to stormwater as a resource, it is noted that provisions for reseed dace may result in regulating stormwater management practices.</p> <p>74) Text for Policy 3.7.2.16 and 3.7.2.17</p>	<p>bedrock and refer generally to hazardous lands and hazardous sites.</p> <p>66) Policy 3.6.1.8 should be modified to add "stable top of bank" and that greater setbacks may be required based on geotechnical review.</p> <p>67) Policy 3.6.1.9 should be modified to remove the reference to MNR.</p> <p>68) The City-wide Drainage Study identifies flood vulnerable areas inside and outside of the SPA.</p> <p>69) The items noted in the suggested policy are covered in existing Policy 3.7.2.15 and 3.7.2.16.</p> <p>70) The Environmental Management Guide will include appropriate references, including the "Greater Golden Horseshoe Area Conservation Authorities' Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction."</p> <p>71) Policy 3.7.2.9 should be modified to refer generally to best practices and include a reference to TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design</p>	<p>functions.</p> <p>46) Policy 3.4.1.1 and Policy 3.4.1.3 are changed as follows: 3.4.1.1. To recognize the Oak Ridges Moraine as a Provincially significant natural feature that requires special regard and protection. 3.4.1.3. That the use of land within the Oak Ridges Moraine identified on Schedule 4 is subject to the applicable policies of this section as written to be in conformity with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</p> <p>47) No change recommended.</p> <p>48) Policy 3.4.1.15 is changed as follows: 3.4.1.15. That the key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their minimum vegetation protection zones, identified in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, are equivalent to the Core Features of the Natural Heritage Network and are subject to the policies of this Plan applicable to Core Features. Key Natural Heritage Features in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area include wetlands, significant portions of habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species, fish habitat, areas of</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>is suggested to address minimum stormwater facility requirements mandated by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), reference to the TRCA stormwater management criteria, and reference to low impact development (LID) measures.</p> <p>75) It is suggested to remove the reference to MNR in Policy 3.7.2.21 and add a reference to the TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010). +N137</p> <p>76) It is suggested to delete Policy 3.7.2.21 and Policy 3.7.2.22 if the suggested wording for Policies 3.7.2.16 and 3.7.2.17 are adopted.</p> <p>77) TRCA question the term "direct discharge" as used in Policy 3.7.2.29 to avoid stormwater runoff into Core Features.</p> <p>78) It is requested to add a subsection in Section 4.2.1 that prescribes the need to undertake the appropriate EA study for transportation infrastructure crossing watercourses, as well as entering into the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area and Greenbelt Plan area.</p>	<p>Guide (2010).</p> <p>72) Other references to similar studies refer generally to maintaining pre-development water balance. Policy 3.7.2.10 provides further detail with respect to significant recharge areas.</p> <p>73) There are no specific suggestions to change policies. The comment is noted that provisions for the protection of reaside dace may affect stormwater management practices as it affects flows to watercourses.</p> <p>74) Policy 3.7.2.16 and 3.7.2.17 should be modified to reflect suggestions by TRCA. to address minimum stormwater facility requirements mandated by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), reference to the TRCA stormwater management criteria, and reference to low impact development (LID) measures. Policy 3.7.2.16 refers to general stormwater management objectives and makes reference LID measures in a treatment train approach. Policy 3.7.2.17 refers to MOE minimum standards.</p> <p>75) Policy 3.7.2.21 should be modified to remove the reference to MNR and add a</p>	<p>natural and scientific interest (life science), significant valleylands, significant woodlands, significant wildlife habitat, sandbarrens, savannahs and tallgrass prairies. Hydrologically Sensitive Features in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area include permanent and intermittent streams, wetlands and kettle lakes and seepage areas and springs.</p> <p>49) Policy 3.4.1.15 and Policy 3.4.1.17 are changed to refer consistently to hydrologically sensitive features, as noted in Point 48) above and Point 50) below.</p> <p>50) Policy 3.4.1.17 is changed as follows: 3.4.1.17. That no amendments will be required to Schedule 2 where minor changes to the boundary of the key natural heritage feature or hydrologically sensitive feature are based on studies carried out in accordance with this Plan or the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan technical papers, or updated information from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Province of Ontario, Department of Fisheries and Oceans or their delegate is provided to the satisfaction of the City</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>reference to the TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010).</p> <p>76) Policies 3.7.2.16 and Policy 3.7.2.17 will be modified to include reference to TRCA's stormwater management criteria and low impact development guidelines, rather than to satisfy these criteria and guidelines. Hence, Policy 3.7.2.21 and Policy 3.7.2.22 should remain.</p> <p>77) Policy 3.7.2.29 will be deleted as elements of treating stormwater runoff in a treatment train approach are noted in other policies.</p> <p>78) The City concurs with the recommendation.</p>	<p>of Vaughan.</p> <p>51) Policy 3.4.1.18 is changed as follows: 3.4.1.18. That any change to Schedule 2 which affects the boundary of a wetland or an area of natural and scientific interest (life science) or confirmation of the boundaries of a feature not included on Schedule 2 including habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species or fish habitat, will only be made after consultation with the District office of the Ministry of Natural Resources and in the case of fish habitat, with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority as the delegate for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.</p> <p>52) Policy 3.4.1.19 is changed as follows: 3.4.1.19. That the presence or absence of significant portions of habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species, fish habitat, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, and seepage areas and springs on the lands subject to a development or site alteration application and within 120 metres of the application, shall be confirmed through environmental studies using criteria established by the</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Province of Ontario, to the satisfaction of the City of Vaughan in consultation with the Toronto and Region and Conservation Authority, the Region of York and Provincial Ministries. Key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features identified on the Oak Ridges Moraine but not shown on Schedules to this Plan, shall be subject to the provisions in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of this Plan respecting key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features. Fish habitat on the Oak Ridges Moraine are to include but are not limited to all hydrologically sensitive features with surface water characteristics.</p> <p>53) Policy 3.4.1.24 is changed as follows: That for every application in the Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area, Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Linkage Area, Oak Ridges Moraine Countryside Area and Oak Ridges Moraine Settlement Area, commenced on or after April 23, 2007 major development as defined in policy 3.4.1.23 is prohibited unless: a. the major development conforms with the Humber River Watershed Plan and Don River Watershed Plan; and b. a water budget and conservation</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>plan, prepared by the Region of York in accordance with Section 25 of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and demonstrating that the water supply required for the major development is sustainable, has been completed.</p> <p>54) Schedule 5 will be changed to reflect the Aggregate Resource Areas as shown on Map 9 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by Regional Council in December 2009).</p> <p>55) No change recommended.</p> <p>56) Policy 3.4.1.42 is changed as follows: That, on lands designated Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area, Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Linkage Area and Oak Ridges Moraine Countryside Area on Schedule 4, service and utility trenches for transportation, infrastructure and utilities where permitted in accordance with policies 3.4.1.39., 3.4.1.40., and 3.4.1.41, shall be planned, designed and constructed so as to keep disruption of the natural groundwater flow to a minimum.</p> <p>57) Policy 3.4.1.43 (a) is changed as follows:</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>That within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area shown on Schedule 4, an application for major development shall be accompanied by a sewage and water system plan that demonstrates:</p> <p>a. that the ecological integrity of hydrologically sensitive and key natural heritage features will be maintained;</p> <p>58) No change recommended.</p> <p>59) Policy 3.4.2.3 is changed as follows: That within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System as identified on Schedule 4 Agricultural and existing Rural Residential uses are permitted as identified on Schedule 13 and subject to the applicable policies of section 9.2.2 and subject to the policies of 3.4.2.4 through 3.4.2.6 below.</p> <p>60) Policy 3.4.2.5(a) is changed as follows: That new development or site alteration in lands designated as Greenbelt Natural Heritage System (as permitted by the policies of this Plan) shall demonstrate that:</p> <p>a. there will be no negative effects on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features or their functions;</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>61) No change recommended.</p> <p>62) Policy 3.4.2.7 is changed as follows: That, within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt as identified on Schedule 4, Agricultural and existing Rural Residential uses are permitted as identified on Schedule 13 and subject to the applicable policies of section 9.2.2 of this Plan.</p> <p>63) Policy 3.4.2.16 is changed as follows That within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan Area, existing and new mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits shall comply with the Aggregate Resources Act as directed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the provisions of the applicable Provincial Plan.</p> <p>64) No change recommended.</p> <p>65) Policy 3.6.1.1 is changed as follows: To protect the safety of the public by directing development to locations outside of hazardous lands and hazardous sites.</p> <p>66) Policy 3.6.1.8 is changed as follows:</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>That all development shall be set back a minimum of 10 metres from the stable top of bank and may require greater setbacks based on geotechnical review.</p> <p>67) Policy 3.6.1.9 is changed as follows: To minimize risk associated with erosion, in areas where slopes exceed 10% and/or in areas adjacent to valley and stream corridors, development may be permitted only if the erosion and siltation control measures are satisfactory to the City of Vaughan in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and subject to the policies of this Plan.</p> <p>68) No change recommended.</p> <p>69) No change recommended.</p> <p>70) No change recommended.</p> <p>71) Policy 3.7.2.9 is changed as follows: That low-impact development techniques, as described in TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010), will be established, where appropriate, for all new Block Plans, or Site Plans for large development sites, in order to protect groundwater</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>resources and aquatic habitat and ensure that overall groundwater flow patterns are not impaired. The Master Environment and Servicing Plans shall reflect these best practices.</p> <p>72) No change recommended.</p> <p>73) No change recommended.</p> <p>74) Policy 3.7.2.16 and Policy 3.7.2.17 are changed as follows: 3.7.2.16 That new development must satisfy the City and demonstrate consistency with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Stormwater Management Criteria for water quantity (flood flow) control, water quality control, erosion control and water balance, groundwater recharge and water balance, for the protection of hydrologically sensitive features. TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria are based on current research, watershed planning and hydrology studies, therefore the criteria is subject to change based on the approval and adoption of updated studies.</p> <p>3.7.2.17 To satisfy the City and demonstrate consistency with the Toronto and Region Conservation</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Authority (TRCA) Stormwater Management Criteria, innovative stormwater management approaches must be implemented and designed in accordance with the Ministry of Environment Stormwater Management Practices Planning and Design Manual and with reference to TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010), as may be updated from time to time. For all development, a treatment train approach to stormwater must be considered consisting of source controls (for example, green roofs, permeable paving, improved urban tree canopy), conveyance controls (for example, bioswales and permeable pipes), and end of pipe treatment (for example, wetlands and ponds).</p> <p>75) Policy 3.7.2.21 is changed as follows: That the Master Environment and Servicing Plan will apply a range of stormwater management practices, including Low Impact Development, to address water quality control, baseflow management, temperature moderation and aquatic habitat protection. The selection of stormwater management techniques will be governed by flood</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>and erosion conditions, the type of fisheries present, soil conditions and local groundwater conditions. Preliminary and final design will be to the satisfaction of the City in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. Potential stormwater management practices to be considered in development are identified in the TRCA's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010) and will consider innovative naturalized approaches to stormwater management and maximize opportunities to enhance open space and natural heritage resources.</p> <p>76) No change is recommended.</p> <p>77) It is recommended to delete Policy 3.7.2.29.</p> <p>78) It is recommended to add a policy to Section 4.2.1 as follows: To direct the undertaking of an appropriate Environmental Assessment study and or process for transportation infrastructure related to crossings of watercourses, and/or entering into the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area and Greenbelt Plan area.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
134	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Embee Properties Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 9771 - 9799 Jane Street & 9930 - 9980 Dufferin Street</p>	<p>Drive-Throughs</p> <p>1) Proponent reiterated an itemized list of benefits provided by drive-throughs.</p> <p>2) The City's proposed policies do not reflect the purpose of drive-through facilities nor recognize their essential value as established land uses. The City fails to establish a suitable basis for their recommendations.</p>	<p>1) While drive-throughs may provide convenience and are a popular mode of retail service delivery, they present challenges to pedestrianization and intensification to achieve a more compact, sustainable urban form.</p> <p>2) The approach espoused by the City of Vaughan the January 25, 2010 Committee of the Whole Report ("City of Vaughan Improvement and Potential Regulation of Drive-Through Facilities") is generally consistent with municipalities such as the City of Mississauga and Town of Oakville who have prohibited drive-throughs in intensification areas, district centres and implemented minimum setbacks from residential areas among other measures in the Zoning By-law. The strategy was devised to suit Vaughan's unique conditions with its nascent district centres, the planned downtown (Vaughan Metropolitan Centre) supported by a future subway station and established heritage conservation districts.</p> <p>The proposed drive-through policy in Volume 1 of the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan is consistent with existing City policies in the Maple, Thornhill, Kleinburg-Nashville, Woodbridge</p>	<p>The following addition is recommended after the first sentence in Policy 5.2.3.7:</p> <p>"Drive-through facilities shall not be permitted in Intensification Areas (Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, Primary Centres, Local Centres, and Regional Primary Intensification Corridors) and Heritage Conservation Districts. Where permitted on local Primary Intensification Corridors, it is not intended to permit them in Heritage Conservation Districts."</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Heritage Conservation Districts, Carrville and Vellore district centres as well as the Steeles West Secondary Plan that do not permit drive-throughs in areas where a pedestrian oriented and compact built form is promoted. The draft Plan continues the prohibition of drive-through uses in Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and in three (3) other intensification centres and along intensification corridors through Highway 7, Bathurst Street, Centre Street, Jane Street, Rutherford Road, Yonge Street and Major Mackenzie Drive. The policy does not prohibit drive-throughs in other areas of the city.</p> <p>Car dependence has many causes and effects. The report did not focus on the environmental causes or effects of the automobile; however, it did acknowledge known links between carbon monoxide emissions, pollution and the urban heat island effect. The main thesis of the report focused on the impact of the cars on an urban scale, suggesting that car culture inhibits pedestrianization by discouraging other forms of mobility, especially where the design, scale and density of the urban environment continues to favour the automobile. Areas of the City must be set aside</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>where pedestrianization and a more compact, mixed-use urban form with a strong public realm may establish itself.</p> <p>CPPI does acknowledge that drive-throughs do generate noise, but that they are located near roads carrying large volumes of traffic not in quiet areas. This comment appears to support setbacks for drive-throughs from quiet residential areas, which is a policy provided in the Official Plan.</p> <p>The correlation between car dependence and sprawl was questioned. Drive-throughs can be both a cause and a response to sprawl. Through the policies of the draft OP, promoting pedestrianization and transit use in Intensification Areas can reverse sprawl. These areas represent a small fraction of Vaughan's developable land area.</p> <p>The inclusion of policies in the Official Plan to restrict drive-throughs in certain Intensification Areas is part of a coordinated City and Regional approach that includes a review and overall reduction of parking standards and investments in higher order transit as well as mixed-use development at a certain level of intensity. It also</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>represents a paradigm shift towards city building and place making. Measures are therefore needed to specifically address the causes and effects of sprawl, and as drive-through use is linked to car dependence within a prevailing car culture, policies are needed for them within the Official Plan.</p> <p>4) Drive-through Zoning By-laws and Design Guidelines will follow upon adoption of the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>5) In recognition of those industries concerns whose retail activities include drive-through facilities, a modification to the prohibition of drive-throughs is proposed. The change in policy recognizes that some of the local Intensification Corridors (as distinct from Regional Primary Intensification Corridors) also perform a linking arterial function where lower intensity, single-use development is permitted. Provided that drive-through facilities associated with developments adhere to the urban design objectives they may be permitted on local Primary Intensification Corridors.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
135	<p>DATE: June 11, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Cam Milani</p> <p>LOCATION: Part of Lots 30 & 31, Concession 2</p>	<p>Request to defer OP policies with respect to subject lands pending outcome of settlement discussions with the City.</p> <p>Request Site Specific Area/Special Policy for subject lands</p>	<p>Need to be consistent with the Region of York Official Plan. Subject lands are in the Rural Area designation (Map 8 of Region OP). Map 1 (Structure) depicts lands are Natural Core and Natural Linkage of the ORMCP. It is also recognized as "Ministers Decision on ORMCP Designation Deferred".</p>	<p>Map change is recommended on Schedule 1, 13 and 13J to show as "Ministers Decision on ORMCP Designation Deferred".</p>
136	<p>DATE: June 01, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Aird and Berlis LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) Concerned with the proximity of "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation to Employment lands.</p> <p>2) No sensitive land uses should be permitted in the Commercial Mixed-Use designation.</p> <p>3) Onus should be placed on non-employment uses to ensure compatibility with employment uses.</p> <p>4) Schedule 1 should be amended to define "Employment Areas" as that term is defined in the Growth Plan and the PPS.</p> <p>5) Section 9.2.2.9 (c) and 9.2.2.9 (d) should include policies with respect to the impact of new uses on Employment Areas.</p>	<p>1,2,3) Concerns raised focus on the impact that locating sensitive land uses in proximity to existing or planned Employment Areas may have on the on-going viability of industrial operations, conflicts due to noise or vibration. In particular the respondent recommends that sensitive uses like hotels or public uses not be permitted in Commercial Mixed-Use designations, which is the designation provided on the Intensification Corridors that front employment areas, or if these uses are permitted they be required to demonstrate that they will not present land use conflicts with industrial/employment uses. Also it is suggested that "Primary Intensification Corridors" abutting Employment Areas be recognized as Employment Areas, to limit the opportunities for their conversion to non-employment uses like</p>	<p>1) That Section 5.1.2 "Directing Economic Activity" be amended by adding the following at the end of Paragraph 5.1.2.3 b): "and that such compatibility, including any required mitigation, be addressed in an Employment Area Compatibility Assessment report".</p> <p>2) That the requirement for such a report for sensitive uses locating in proximity to Employment Areas be included Section 10.1.3.3 as a study which may be required in support of a complete application for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Consent, Draft Plan of Subdivision/Condominium and/or site plan agreement.</p> <p>3) and 4) That Schedule 1, "Urban Structure" be amended to include</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>residential.</p> <p>This is consistent with the City's objective to preserve the viability of employment areas. No changes to the uses permitted are recommended. However, the introduction of a policy requiring sensitive uses to address compatibility with industrial/employment uses is recommended along with measures to ensure that lands designated Intensification Corridor abutting Employment Areas are considered part of that employment area.</p> <p>4) Schedule 1 will be amended to recognize Employment uses within Intensification Corridors.</p>	<p>"Primary Intensification Corridors" shown abutting "Employment Areas" be identified as also being a part of the "Employment Area".</p> <p>5) Section 5.2.1 be amended by adding the following policy: "To protect Vaughan's manufacturing, industrial and warehousing sectors from potential impacts, any development or redevelopment of lands for sensitive land uses located within 500 metres of an Employment Area, may be required to undertake appropriate environmental studies (e.g., noise, dust, etc.), to be identified on a case by case basis, in order to ensure land use compatibility with the surrounding Employment Area lands. As a result of the studies, on-site or off-site mitigation measures may be required prior to development of the sensitive land use."</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
137	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Savanta Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 41</p>	<p>It is requested that the Natural Heritage System mapping be modified in Block 41 in two locations. The letter does not clearly identify the changes required, so an interpretation of the information in the letter is provided in this response.</p> <p>1) The Core Feature designation overlaps part of a cultivated field in the central portion of Block 41 within and just outside of the Greenbelt Plan area. It is requested to remove the Core Feature designation associated with the upper reaches of the drainage channel.</p> <p>2) The eastern drainage channel is described from the upper reaches to a more defined valley feature downstream. it is requested to remove the Core Feature designation from the upper reaches.</p>	<p>1) The portion of the Core Feature noted in the letter appears to be associated with a permanent stream, but there is no data to classify it as cold, cool or a warmwater stream according to Figure 6 of the background report, Natural Heritage in the City. Figure 7 of the background report, Natural Heritage in the City, appears to identify the stream as a permanent coldwater stream. In addition, there are pre-1988 observations of endangered redbreasted dace downstream of the location in the vicinity of Teston Road.</p> <p>It is recommended to maintain the current Natural Heritage Network mapping subject to evaluation and review through the Secondary Plan process. Core Features policies allow for minor modifications of Core Features based on appropriate evaluations. Refer to Item 19B for details of revised Core Feature policies. Furthermore, any modifications to natural feature boundaries in the Greenbelt Plan area requires a Natural Heritage Evaluation following procedures provided by the Province.</p> <p>2) The eastern drainage channel is identified as an intermittent stream on</p>	<p>1) and 2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Figure 6 and Figure 7 of the background report, Natural Heritage in the City. The Core Feature designation follows the drainage channel north of the extent of the stream mapping. The information provided by the proponents is useful for the Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>It is recommended to maintain the current Natural Heritage Network mapping subject to evaluation and review through the Secondary Plan process. Core Features policies allow for minor modifications of Core Features based on appropriate evaluations. Refer to Item 19B for details of revised Core Feature policies. In addition, minor watercourses can be modified according to Policy 3.3.1.4. Any modifications to natural feature boundaries in the Greenbelt Plan area requires a Natural Heritage Evaluation following procedures provided by the Province.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
138	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 12011 Pine Valley Road</p>	<p>Objects to Enhancement Area in subject property and to policy 3.2.3.10.</p> <p>1) A concern is raised about the Enhancement Areas shown overlapping the subject property and it is requested to provided "the basis used to identify the Enhancement Areas".</p> <p>2) It is requested to remove the Enhancement Area in proximity to Pine Valley Drive.</p> <p>3) A concern is raised that the Enhancement Areas policies are too restrictive and not consistent with the description provided in the background report, Natural Heritage in the City.</p> <p>4) It is requested to provided "the basis used to identify the Enhancement Areas".</p> <p>5) There is a request to remove a Core Feature designation from a drainage feature.</p>	<p>1) The Enhancement Area identifies a potential linkage extending from the Greenbelt Plan area along a drainage feature. Refer to the background report, Natural Heritage in the City, for criteria to delineate Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>2) The Enhancement Area includes a drainage feature and connects the Greenbelt Plan area to sites of existing natural cover according to the TRCA Target Terrestrial Natural Heritage System. The drainage feature is identified as an intermittent stream according to Figure 6 of the background report, Natural Heritage in the City. The drainage feature is identified as an intermittent coldwater stream according to Figure 7 of the background report, Natural Heritage in the City. Given the available data, it is appropriate to identify the feature as an Enhancement Area in order to undertake appropriate studies to determine if any parts of the Enhancement Areas should be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>3) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas will be modified to recognize that development is permitted on all or part of the Enhancement Area subject to further environmental studies to determine the</p>	<p>1) No change recommended.</p> <p>2) No change recommended.</p> <p>3) Refer to Item 19B for details of the revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features. Refer to Item 19B for the revised Enhancement Areas policies.</p> <p>4) Refer to the background report, Natural Heritage in the City, for criteria to delineate Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>5) All drainage features are included in Core Features. Modifications can be made to minor watercourses according to Policy 3.3.1.4.</p>	
<p>139</p>	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: John Simone</p> <p>LOCATION: Adjacent to proposed highway interchange for Highway 427 and Rutherford Rd.</p>	<p>1) Requests that the same land use designation established in OPA 450 be applied to the subject lands.</p> <p>2) The subject lands are located in the SE quadrant of the intersection of Rutherford Road and the Highway No. 427 Extension within the West Vaughan Employment Area. The draft Official Plan (Volume 1) shows the subject lands designated Prestige Area and General Employment. The respondent believes the designations are too restrictive especially as it applies to the maximum permitted office use (7,500 sq m.).</p>	<p>1) It is not proposed to apply OPA 450 policies to specific sites.</p> <p>2) The restriction of office uses are intended to protect employment areas consistent with the Provincial and Regional policies. The respondent has not submitted a planning justification report or analysis in support of the request. This matter will be addressed through the finalization of the West Vaughan Employment Area Plan in Volume 2 and any mapping changes required to Volume 1 will be incorporated as required.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) With respect to the proposed land use designations this matter should be resolved through the finalization of the West Vaughan Employment Area Plan and that the Official Plan (Volume 1) be amended, as required, to accommodate any necessary changes.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
140	<p>DATE: June 01, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Garfin Zeidenberg LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 396 York Hill Blvd.</p>	<p>Objects to zoning by-law amendment Z.10.015 and the proposed definition of "places of worship".</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>
141	<p>DATE: May 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Levi Y. Jacobson</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Concerned that community is at the mercy of developers and subject to restrictive policies that make it difficult to create a place of worship.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>
142	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Evans Planning</p> <p>LOCATION: 1118 and 1136 Centre Street</p>	<p>Supports the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" policies in draft OP, and request that the subordination policies in Policy 12.2.10 of Volume 2 be reconsidered.</p>	<p>At this time, the Volume 2 policies are proposed to be applied to the lands. These policies implement study findings that were subject to an extensive consultation process. Any changes to the land uses on these lands should only be considered through a future study of OPA 672.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
143	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Teresa Forbes Brian Forbes</p> <p>LOCATION: 24 Lester B. Pearson Street</p>	<p>Proponent requests a change in land use designations to properties designated "Low-Rise Residential" by OPA 601, as amended by OPA 633. Request that the lands be designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" consistent with the surrounding properties.</p>	<p>The Kleinburg Core policies in OPA 601, as amended by OPA 633, are being carried forward into Volume 2 of the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan. These policies were subject to an extensive public consultation process. Any changes to the land use designation should only be considered through a detailed land use review. No planning justification or other analysis was submitted to support the request.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
144	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 10056 and 10068 Keele Street</p>	<p>1) Policy 9.2.3.2d. states that townhouses shall front onto a public street. Townhouse blocks not fronting onto a public street are only permitted if the unit(s) flanking the street provide(s) a front yard and front door facing the public street. WCGI is of the opinion that this design treatment could be incorporated into the façade of the townhouse in order to address the public street without providing an actual front yard and front door face condition on the street.</p> <p>2) WCGI does not wish to have prescribed distances in the Official Plan rather it should be assessed on a site specific basis.</p>	<p>1) The primary entrance into the unit should face onto a public street. This would promote a better streetscape image and provide "eyes" and activity on the public street. Accordingly the request is not supported.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.2.3.2.e. states that the distance between blocks of Townhouses that are not separated by a public street shall be a minimum 18 metres in order to maximize daylight, enhance landscaping treatments and provide privacy for individual units.</p> <p>These are minimum standards that would ensure that developments provide a better quality of life for residents. However, Section 9.2.1.2 does permit flexibility to the effect that minor</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>variations will be permitted to the built form policies, provided that they are supported through an Urban Design brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	
<p>145A</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: David Schenck</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter objects to the proposed urban expansion areas for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) urban expansion area is not needed yet the Official Plan is being rushed into law; ii) an economic analysis has not been undertaken in support of the plan; iii) residential development is typically a negative cost to the city and property taxes don't cover infrastructure maintenance and services; iv) the Region of York Land Budget Report (January 2008) concludes that "boundary expansions will occur on white belt lands in Vaughan". An updated Land Budget Report in April 	<p>Refer to Comment on Urban Boundary Expansion under Item 34.</p> <p>The City's Official Plan must implement the mandated targets assigned by the Province of Ontario through the Region of York. Given that the growth targets are mandated and the City has no ability to change the population and density targets, a fiscal analysis is not warranted.</p> <p>The urban boundary expansion being proposed is not significant in the context of the existing and potential development contemplated by the draft Official Plan. It is anticipated that the policies of the new Official Plan will maintain the existing residential to non-residential development mix and therefore, not result in a significant fiscal impact</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>2009 reiterates the requirement for an urban boundary expansion identifying that the region has debt financed water and waste water infrastructure and urban expansion is required in order to for a sufficient land supply to be available for development in order to ensure the Region is able to collect development charges; and,</p> <p>v) the collection of development charges should be linked to intensification, not urban sprawl.</p>	<p>relating to a shifting of proportions.</p> <p>The Official Plan does not generally deal specifically with recommendations relating to service levels provided by the City. City Staff have identified potential impacts on services in the review of the Official Plan. Many of these have been identified in the supporting master plans. The impact of changes to service levels would be prioritized and the fiscal impact determined as part of these master plans.</p> <p>The City will continue to monitor the fiscal impact of the master plans over time. The Official Plan must be updated every five years, and the financing plan set out in the Development Charge Background Study must also be updated at least every five years.</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
145B	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Deb Schulte</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter expresses opposition to the proposed urban expansion for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) the lack of a public process / discussion respecting the decision to expand the urban boundary;</p> <p>ii) that the City has not satisfied the criteria in the Places to Grow Plan required to support an urban expansion, in particular, an economic study is required;</p> <p>iii) the Plan would facilitate significantly more growth than is being acknowledged and with the addition of the "whitebelt" land are far in of the required population numbers from the Province and the Region (accommodating 4440,000 people instead of 419,000);</p> <p>iv) the "Where and How to Grow" report identified that an urban expansion is not necessary; a choice was presented by the document on how the growth would occur;</p> <p>v) the Hemson Report identifies a number of "to be determined" housing unit figures coming out of secondary plans;</p>	<p>Refer to Comments under Item 34 and Item 145A.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>vi) the City can accommodate the required growth within the City's urban boundary, without urban expansion;</p> <p>vii) both Hemson and Urban Strategies report agree that 30,000 units still need to be built within the existing OPA areas and that 70% of these units are ground related; currently over 85% of Vaughan's housing stock is ground related; this is an opportunity to introduce a better mix of housing types into Vaughan; and,</p> <p>ix) urban sprawl leads to higher taxes, more congestion and negative environmental effects;</p>		
<p>146A</p>	<p>DATE: June 09, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Brownridge Ratepayers Association</p> <p>LOCATION: North/East corner of Dufferin St. & Clark Avenue; and North/East</p>	<p>1) Object to land designation at northeast corner of Dufferin St. and Clark Avenue. Proposed designation will affect community negatively.</p> <p>The proposed Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation is not acceptable to the community. The community has more than enough residential and commercial development. The proposed change will negatively impact the community. If City wants to make change, one more community meeting should be</p>	<p>1) The current proposed designation for these lands would permit a Height of 4 storeys and a Density of 1.5. It would be appropriate to reduce the Height to 3 storeys and the Density to 1.25 to lessen impacts to the surrounding land uses.</p> <p>2) The subject lands are under the policy framework of Volume 2, Centre Street Secondary Plan (OPA 672).</p>	<p>1) It is recommended that Schedule 13-T be amended to reflect a Height of 3 storeys and a Density of 1.25.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	corner of Dufferin St. & Centre Street	<p>organized.</p> <p>2) Object to land use designation on northeast corner of Dufferin and Centre Street. Proposed designation adds more residential to a relatively new plaza, with traffic difficulties with the addition of residential to this corner.</p>		
146B	<p>DATE: May 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Brownridge Ratepayers Association</p> <p>LOCATION: North/East corner of Dufferin St. & Clark Avenue; and North/East corner of Dufferin St. & Centre Street; Concord Florist on Highway 7</p>	<p>Follow up on May 21, 2010 meeting. Express concerns with zoning on a number of sites.</p> <p>Centre St. Study: Wish to see new development be less than 3 storeys and have traditional roof.</p> <p>1) Do not support proposed designations at the northeast corner of Dufferin Street and Clark Avenue. Does not see any planning merit/benefit for residential uses being added to a plaza. Ratepayers want more than just meetings to hear community views before staff/consultant make recommendation to Council.</p> <p>2) Northeast and northwest corner of Dufferin Street and Centre Street do not want residential use at this location. Support existing O.P. and Zoning for northwest corner of Dufferin St. and Centre St.</p>	<p>1) The current proposed designation for these lands would permit a Height of 4 storeys and a Density of 1.5. It would be appropriate to reduce the Height to 3 storeys and the Density to 1.25 to lessen impacts to the surrounding land uses.</p> <p>2) and 3) The subject lands are under the policy framework of Volume 2, Centre Street Secondary Plan (OPA 672).</p> <p>Policies of OPA 672 should be reviewed in a further study involving community consultation given the new framework for the City.</p> <p>4) The subject lands are under the policy framework of Volume 2 (Concord Centre). These lands are subject to recent development applications and are also designated as lands subject to a Secondary Plan. Detailed land use</p>	<p>1) It is recommended that Schedule 13-T be amended to reflect a Height of 3 storeys and a Density of 1.25.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>3) Centre St. Study Brownridge Ratepayers Association wishes to leave things as they are. Any development must be equal in height to existing homes. New development must be less than 3 floors and have traditional roof, not a flat roof.</p> <p>4) Concord Floral Lands Brownridge Ratepayers do not want Official Plan and Zoning to be changed. The City needs more employment lands.</p>	<p>permissions will be determined through a public planning process when the Secondary Plan Study is undertaken.</p>	
<p>147</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 158</p>	<p>Request project on subject property be exempt from proposed changes to draft OP.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 21.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 21.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
148A	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Richard Ristich Raymond Ristich</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Highway 27 and Langstaff Road</p>	<p>The respondent is requesting that the subject 19.5 acre site at the northwest corner of Langstaff Road and Highway 27 be designated commercial to permit large scale retail uses including a shopping centre, restaurants, office uses and gas stations.</p>	<p>No supporting justification was submitted in support of the request. The subject lands are located within the West Vaughan Employment Area lands, which will be contained in Volume 2 to this plan. It will establish the land use policies for this area. This matter will be addressed through the finalization of the West Vaughan Employment Area Plan and any mapping changes required to Volume 1 will be incorporated as required. Therefore, no action is warranted as it respects Volume 1 of the plan at this time.</p>	<p>This matter should be resolved through the finalization of the West Vaughan Employment Area Plan and that the Official Plan (Volume 1) be amended, as required, to accommodate any necessary changes.</p>
148B	<p>DATE: July 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Richard Ristich Raymond Ristich</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Highway 27 and Langstaff Road</p>	<p>Request subject lands be designated to permit large scale retail uses.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 148A.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 148A.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
149	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Sustainable Vaughan</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>General Comments objecting to the finishing of OP before the municipal election. Also opposed the proposed urban expansion for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) During the "Visionary Workshops" the public supported no more urban sprawl.</p> <p>ii) The "How to Grow" Report stated that new growth could be accommodated within the City's existing urban boundaries;</p> <p>iii) Concern with the population figures used to support the proposed urban expansion; and</p> <p>iv) the City has not proven that the proposed urban expansion is necessary.</p>	<p>Refer to Comments under Items 34 and 145A.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
150	<p>DATE: June 01, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wendy Hofstatter</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Objects to 3% urban boundary increase. General comments on transportation issues in Vaughan.</p>	<p>Refer to Comments under Items 34 and 145A.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
151A	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MMM Group Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 11100 Huntington Road</p>	<p>The land owner has submitted applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law (Files OP.09.036 and 2.09.036) to permit outside storage on the property on a temporary basis. A request is made that the current applications be considered under the OPA 600 framework.</p>	<p>Policy 9.2.2.17 would prohibit outside storage on Agricultural land on a permanent or temporary basis. The applications will be considered under the current policies provided they are finalized in a timely manner.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
151B	<p>DATE: May 25, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MMM Group Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 11100 Huntington Road</p>	<p>MMM Group Limited on behalf of their client DiBattista Farms Ltd. has requested that their lands west of Huntington Road and south of Kirby Road in an area identified as the 'North of Nashville Precinct' be included in the current urban expansion.</p>	<p>The parcel west of Huntington Road, across from Area 2 in the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan, and east of the CP Rail tracks should be considered for residential development at some point in the future, in order to create a complete community as part of Area 2. The rail line acts as an effective boundary between residential and employment land uses. While it may be premature to designate this western parcel as part of an urban expansion at this time, consideration should be given to include a policy that would allow for an Official Plan amendment in the future. The appropriate land use would be determined based on a planning justification supported by technical studies and analysis.</p>	<p>A new Policy 2.2.3.7 be added as follows:</p> <p>"That the lands fronting on Huntington Road, between the rail line to the west and the Huntington Road Community to the immediate east are recognized as an area for future residential development as an extension of the Huntington Road Community with the aim of establishing a more complete community. This extension will require an Official Plan amendment in the future."</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
151C	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MMM Group Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 67, west side of Huntington Road</p>	<p>Refer to Issue under Item 51B.</p>	<p>Refer to Comment under Item 51B.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
152	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MAM Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) Objects to permitted range of uses in Employment Areas being significantly reduced.</p> <p>2) Objects to urban design policies in the Official Plan.</p>	<p>1) The Policies set out in the New Official Plan restrict the amount of retail and office uses within Employment Areas. This is consistent with the policy objective of "employment land protection" of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan.</p> <p>2) It is a general policy initiative to design and built sustainable buildings through this Official Plan. This is an important initiative that should be supported. Through the Development Review process, the City will be implementing more detailed sustainable building initiatives that inform this policy in the future.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>It is also a key objective of the Plan to provide direction on how to achieve a consistent, high quality public realm and built form through good urban design. However, Policy 9.2.1.2 provides some flexibility to vary the building type requirements.</p>	
<p>154</p>	<p>DATE: June 09, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Cam Milani</p> <p>LOCATION: Milani Blvd.</p>	<p>The letter addresses two requirements:</p> <p>1) That approved draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-90018 be recognized. The lands are designated as a "Infrastructure and Utilities" in Schedule 13-P.</p> <p>2) The lands west of the valley be designated for Employment Uses.</p>	<p>1) The lands between Highway 27 and the valley are subject to Registered Plan of Subdivision 65M-3966. The lands are also zoned EM1 and EM3 by to site-specific Exception 9(1253). It is appropriate to designate these lands as "General Employment" consistent with the existing development.</p> <p>2) The lands west of the valley are currently identified as deferral area #5 in OPA No.450, they are currently zoned A Agricultural, are located within the Highway 427 Transportation Corridor EA Route Alternatives. The lands are also subject to TRCA approvals. The subject lands are designated Infrastructure and Utilities in the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>The subject lands located generally</p>	<p>1) That Schedule 13-P be amended to designate the lands between Highway 27 and the valley as "General Employment". To recognize the existing zoning and Registered Plan of Subdivision.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>south of Langstaff Road and west of Regional Road 27 appear to include part of a defined valley corridor as well as Regionally Significant woodlands. To the west of the defined valley corridor and stream channel is a drainage feature included in the TRCA generic regulation limit. Schedule 2 will be modified to reflect the appropriate boundaries of the natural features.</p>	
<p>155</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Rimwood Estates Homeowners Association</p> <p>LOCATION: Subdivision at northeast corner of Weston Road and Teston Road.</p>	<p>Believe infrastructure in subject area must be improved before consideration of expanding the urban boundary.</p>	<p>The draft Official Plan recognizes the need for the timely and economical delivery of municipal services to new and existing developments. New community areas will generally be subject to the preparation of secondary plans (S. 10.1.1.1), which will address: The transportation network, including the provision of transit, walking and cycling and connections to City-wide networks; servicing; and the provision of community and human services. The secondary plans will be implemented in more detail by Block Plans (S. 10.1.1.5) which will address: Traffic management, expected volumes, road needs and transit stop locations; and the provision of public transit networks; the provision of municipal services and stormwater</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>management and the location of parks, open spaces, schools, libraries and community centres. Phasing policies will ensure orderly and contiguous development and ensure the adequacy of services. More specific requirements are included in Section 9.2.2.1.3 "New Community Areas", which includes a requirement for the preparation of a mobility plan. These measures are further supported by a framework of policies that address the delivery of roads and transit (S. 4.1), Municipal Services, Utilities and Infrastructure (S. 8.1) and Community Infrastructure (S. 7.1) on a city-wide basis.</p>	
<p>156</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MMM Group Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 71 Colossus Drive</p>	<p>Request amendment to wording of policy 9.2.2.7 (b.iv) to include recognition of subject site as an exception to policy.</p>	<p>The policies of 9.2.2.4(b.ix) and 9.2.2.7(b.iv) in the draft Official Plan permit gas stations subject to a number of criteria. The subject lands have approval for a gas bar however; they are not located on an arterial road or along a major collector road. An amendment is requested to the wording of Section 9.2.2.7(b.iv) to include recognition of the Subject Site (Costco).</p> <p>The subject lands have site-specific Exception 9(989) which provides for various uses, one of which is an automobile gas bar which will maintain</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			the permissions for the gas bar.	
157	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 3400 Teston Road</p>	Request tableland portion of property be designated Prestige Employment (Schedules 13 and 13I) and Employment (Schedule 1).	It is requested that the tableland portion of the subject lands be designated for employment use. The property is almost entirely in the Greenbelt, with about 3,200 square metres of the approximately 4 hectare parcel located outside of the Greenbelt Plan area along Teston Road. The subject lands are located within ROPA 52, which is currently before the OMB. The City's OPA 637 is awaiting approval by the Region of York. At this time, it is inappropriate to redesignate these lands until the final deposition of these two documents.	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
158	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Adrian Visentin</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>The letter identifies several general concerns about protecting the City's farmland and green spaces and is opposed to the proposed urban expansion.</p>	<p>The population projections to be accommodated by the City are mandated from the Province of Ontario, through the Regional Municipality of York. The Region of York has initiated Official Plan Amendment #2 to the Regional Official Plan for the purposes of approving the two new urban expansion areas in Vaughan. The City's Official Plan must conform to the Regional Plan. The proposed urban expansion is the smallest in Vaughan's history representing approximately 3% of the City's total land area over a 20 year planning horizon.</p> <p>Through analysis conducted by Hemson Consulting and Urban Strategies Inc. it was concluded that approximately 85% of the City's forecast housing demand to 2031 can be accommodated within the existing urban area. The remaining 15% could be met through:</p> <p>a) additional intensification within the built boundary; b) additional development within the designated greenfield area; c) an urban boundary expansion; or d) a combination of some or all of the above.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>The evaluation of these options has led to the conclusion that an urban boundary expansion is the preferred means to address the City's its forecast long term land requirements, because:</p> <p>a) the identified intensification opportunities being reflected in the draft Official Plan will fully satisfy the Region's requirement of 45% of forecast future housing units within the Built Boundary, and will exceed the Growth Plan's policy directive of 40%;</p> <p>b) reliance upon intensification to address all of the City's forecast future housing needs is unrealistic given evidence of market preferences and demand for low density housing types;</p> <p>c) excessively restricting the availability of lands for lower density housing may result in inflated land and housing prices, creating affordability concerns as well as encouraging sprawl in other areas of the region less appropriate to accommodate it;</p> <p>d) minimal opportunity exists to achieve additional development within designated Greenfield areas as planning approvals are already in place for nearly</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>all such lands, and most are already in the process of development; and</p> <p>e) a modest amount of urban expansion will supplement the remaining supply of Greenfield area and provide for balance in the housing market.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan identifies Blocks 27 and 41 for residential community urban expansion and development, subject to completion of secondary plans which will be required to achieve the Regional minimum density requirements of 20 residential units per hectare and 70 residents and jobs per hectare, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan also establishes a comprehensive set of policies to create complete communities with a range of residential densities and a mix of land uses in keeping with Provincial and Regional initiatives. These policies require that a Secondary Plan and a Block Plan be prepared.</p>	
159	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Solmar</p>	<p>Objects to the subject land being designated Natural Areas, and Low-Rise Residential in draft OP, would like to intensify land.</p>	<p>Refer to Comments under Items 34 and 145A.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: South of Highway 7, east of Islington Avenue, west of Bruce Street</p>			
<p>160</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Overiver</p> <p>LOCATION: South of Highway 7, west of Islington Avenue, east of the CP Rail, Part of Lot 62</p>	<p>Objects to the subject land being designated Natural Areas, and located within the Parkway Belt West Lands in draft OP, propose lands for intensification in accordance with Policy 2.2.63.</p>	<p>A change from the Natural Areas designation is requested for the subject lands in the new Official Plan. There are two versions of the TRCA regulated area: (a) one depicts the hazard limits and completely includes the property; and (2) a regulatory limit that depicts the floodline and does not completely include the property. No planning justification or analysis has been submitted in support of the request. Therefore, the "Natural Areas" designation should be maintained.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
162	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ed Barons</p> <p>LOCATION: Kleinburg</p>	<p>Concerned draft OP and secondary plan do not address environment east and west of Nashville.</p>	<p>The respondent suggests that insufficient consideration has been given to the environment when drafting secondary plan policies for the area covered by OPA 699 (Block 61 West) and currently undergoing a Block Plan level review.</p> <p>The OPA and Block Plan include environmental measures that have been developed in consultation with TRCA. For example, a 25 metre wide environmental corridor has been provided to connect a large woodlot to the west with large open spaces on the east side of the Block.</p> <p>The proponent further suggests that development of lands to the south of the village Nashville proper in Block 61 West should not proceed until sufficient efforts have been made to mitigate noise and other environmental impacts. It should be noted that OPA 699 is the policy framework for the Block 61 West Plan and has been approved. The draft North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan in Volume 2 of the draft Official Plan proposes development patterns in the vicinity of the village similar to what is existing. Furthermore, as noted above, OPA 699 requires a 25 metre</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>environmental buffer between the new community envisioned by that plan and the village of Nashville. Traffic calming measures are also proposed within the Block 61 West Block Plan to minimize any truck traffic or noise impacts and a future streetscape study for Nashville Road will further address those issues in detail.</p>	
<p>163</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Policy 3.2.3.4 Natural Heritage Network. Suggested additions to policy in draft OP.</p>	<p>The letter does not reference the lands to which it applies; therefore, more information is required to provide a response. A letter has been forwarded to Weston Consulting Group Inc. requesting that they indicate who they are representing and the specific nature of their concerns.</p>	<p>No changes are recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
164A	<p>DATE: May 25, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: La Primavera</p> <p>LOCATION: 77 Woodstream Boulevard</p>	<p>Request subject property be designated Mid-Rise Mixed Use, believe this will be more reflective of current land use permissions.</p>	<p>The proposed redesignation from "General Employment" to "Mixed-Use is considered appropriate. The lands abut a valley system and other lands designated "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" and would take advantage of the valley exposure. The lands are also currently occupied with a banquet hall and convention centre which is more in keeping with the requested designation. The lands are also in close proximity to transit along Highway 7 and Martingrove Road. A policy to address the interface between Employment areas and any other designation should be added.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-P be amended to designate the lands "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use".</p> <p>That a new Policy 9.1.2.7 is recommended as follows: Where there is a change in land use designation between Employment areas and any other designation, the existing neighbouring uses will be protected where necessary by the provision of landscaping, buffering or screening devices, and measures to reduce nuisances and, where necessary, by regulations for alleviating adverse effects included but not limited by lighting, noise and truck traffic. Such provisions and regulations shall be applied to the proposed development and, where feasible, shall also be extended to the existing use in order to improve its compatibility with the surrounding area; and/or, In all cases where a proposed development seriously affects the amenity of the surrounding area, consideration shall be given to the possibility of ameliorating such conditions, as a condition of approving an application, especially where public health and welfare are directly affected.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
165	<p>DATE: January 00, 1900</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Sustainable Vaughan</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Opposed to urban boundary expansion into White belt lands in draft OP.</p>	<p>The population projections to be accommodated by the City are mandated from the Province of Ontario, through the Regional Municipality of York. The Region of York has initiated Official Plan Amendment #2 to the Regional Official Plan for the purposes of approving the two new urban expansion areas in Vaughan. The City's Official Plan must conform to the Regional Plan. The proposed urban expansion is the smallest in Vaughan's history representing approximately 3% of the City's total land area over a 20 year planning horizon.</p> <p>Through analysis conducted by Hemson Consulting and Urban Strategies Inc. it was concluded that approximately 85% of the City's forecast housing demand to 2031 can be accommodated within the existing urban area for the following reasons.</p> <p>a. the identified intensification opportunities being reflected in the draft Official Plan will fully satisfy the Region's requirement of 45% of forecast future housing units within the Built Boundary, and will exceed the Growth Plan's policy directive of 40%;</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>b. reliance upon intensification to address all of the City's forecast future housing needs is unrealistic given evidence of market preferences and demand for low density housing types;</p> <p>c. excessively restricting the availability of lands for lower density housing may result in inflated land and housing prices, creating affordability concerns as well as encouraging sprawl in other areas of the region less appropriate to accommodate it;</p> <p>d. minimal opportunity exists to achieve additional development within designated Greenfield areas as planning approvals are already in place for nearly all such lands, and most are already in the process of development; and</p> <p>e. a modest amount of urban expansion will supplement the remaining supply of Greenfield area and provide for balance in the housing market.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan identifies Blocks 27 and 41 for residential community urban expansion and development, subject to completion of secondary plans which will be required to achieve the Regional minimum density requirements</p>	

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>of 20 residential units per hectare and 70 residents and jobs per hectare, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan also establishes a comprehensive set of policies to create complete communities with a range of residential densities and a mix of land uses in keeping with Provincial and Regional initiatives. These policies require that a Secondary Plan and a Block Plan be prepared.</p>	
<p>166</p>	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Subdivision 19T- 03V07</p>	<p>Requests that the lands be shown on Schedule 13C as "Estate Residential" instead of "Agricultural" to reflect approved OPA #193 and Exception 9(640) to By-law 1-88.</p>	<p>The lands are zoned "RR – Rural Residential" by Exception 9(640) to By-law 1-88 to facilitate an approved draft plan of subdivision. The existing zoning will facilitate implementation of the development approval. The lands are designated "Agricultural" by the Region of York Official Plan which is consistent with the "Agricultural" designation shown for the land on Schedule 13C of the City's Official Plan.</p> <p>The lands are located in the Greenbelt, but the application preceded and approved the Greenbelt Plan. The Greenbelt Plan does not allow 3 or more lots to be created.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-C be amended to designate the lands "Rural Residential".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
167	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Steeles Avenue and Keele Street</p>	<p>Believe the policies from OPA 450 and 600 may need to be carried forward in order to achieve implementation of OPA 620 as a stand alone amendment. Request no policy change for subject property.</p>	<p>The respondent is requesting confirmation that it is the intent of the City to allow for OPA No. 620 to act as a standalone secondary plan and not subject to change. The OPA 620 lands are recognized on Schedule 14 to the new plan as the "Steeles West" Secondary Plan Area, which policies will be incorporated into Section 11 of Volume 2 of the new plan. These plans reflect and will retain development permissions established prior to the approval of the new plan. Where the policies of Volume 1 conflict with the policies of Volume 2, the Volume 2 policies shall prevail. However, where OPA 620 is silent on new policies, included in Volume 2, these policies will apply to the OPA 620 amendment area.</p> <p>OPA 620 will be dealt with in Volume 2 and the necessary adjustments will be made in order to maintain the existing policy intent of the amendment.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
168	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p>	<p>Request includes 17 acres of land located at the northwest corner of Keele Street and Kirby Road within the urban boundary.</p> <p>1411069 Ontario Inc.- Requests that the urban boundary be expanded to the</p>	<p>The Official Plan will include a policy recognizing all existing uses. The lands are also zoned to recognize and permit the existing uses. The proposed "Agricultural" designation conforms to the Regional Official Plan and the City's Official Plan. Further urban expansion</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	LOCATION: 2480 Kirby Road	north to include subject lands 2480 Kirby Road.	cannot be supported. No planning justification or analysis supporting the request is provided.	
170	DATE: May 25, 2010 RESPONDENT: Frank Greco LOCATION: Vaughan	<p>1) The respondent is requesting that maximum densities in the "Low Rise Mixed-Use" designation along arterial roads, including Islington Avenue be increased from 1.5 to 2.5 FSI and maximum building heights from 4 to 7 storeys. It is proposed that this be achieved through the application of design guidelines and bonusing to achieve compatibility with adjacent residential uses and on-site commercial uses. Such criteria would include consideration of underground parking, angular planes, terracing, shadow effects, setbacks, noise impacts and landscaping.</p> <p>2) The proponent has asked for clarification of the reasoning underlying the use of "Urban Design Criteria" within Volume 1 of the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>3) The respondent has expressed concerns respecting the bonusing policies, which should permit additional height and density for underground</p>	<p>1) The currently proposed heights and densities reflect the site's role in the overall urban structure for the foreseeable future. In addition, these sites also play an important role in the commercial/retail structure of Community Areas. This function will need to be protected and adjacent landowners should also have certainty as to the permitted densities.</p> <p>2) The use of angular planes and terracing maintains sky exposure from the ground plane, protects privacy and reduces the perceived height of buildings. It is especially useful as a policy tool where taller buildings have an interface with lower buildings. The intention is to protect established neighbourhoods through appropriate transitions in massing and to promote a cohesive and harmonious built form that is the hallmark of many great cities.</p> <p>3) The bonusing policies will apply only</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		parking.	to the VMC and Primary Centres in Volume 1. They will not be applied in other areas unless specified in a Secondary Plan.	
171	<p>DATE: May 25, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northeast corner of Highway 50 and Langstaff Road</p>	Request that the OP protect the current zoning approval on the subject lands.	It is not the intent to change approved zoning permissions through the Official Plan Review process. The zoning provisions of By-law 1-88 will remain in effect until they are updated or replaced by zoning consistent with the new Official Plan.	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
172	<p>DATE: June 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association</p> <p>LOCATION: Land along the Highway 7 corridor in proximity to Wigwoss Drive</p>	<p>Two specific requests are made in this letter:</p> <p>1) That the lands adjoining the west side of the Cosmetic Surgery Hospital be a maximum height of 4 storeys within 30m of a Low Density Residential designation and 6 storeys at a greater distance.</p> <p>2) That OPA #661 included a policy to protect existing low density residential areas requiring that the maximum building height within 30m of a Low Density Residential designation be 4 storeys and 12.8m.</p>	<p>1) This statement is correct in that OPA #661 does include the noted policy under Section 8) f) 3) 7). However, this policy is specific to the west side of the Cosmetic Surgery Hospital lands and does not apply to the Vaughanwood Mall site. The transition policies in the Official Plan would ensure that existing Low-Rise Residential areas are protected from new development.</p> <p>2) This statement is correct. However, the transition policies in the new Official Plan, although using different approaches, would ensure that existing Low-Rise Residential areas are protected from new development.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>
174	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Altus Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Believe urban boundary expansions are insufficient to accommodate population growth, and additional residential land in Whitebelt should be included within the expanded area for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) The analysis does not take into account the additional supply of land for single-detached dwellings that Vaughan will need to offset the removal of detached units from the supply in order to accommodate the Region's projected growth of apartments in detached duplexes in Vaughan during 2006-2031;</p>	<p>Refer to Comments under Items 34 and 145A.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>ii) Numerous changes have been made to supply data;</p> <p>iii) Hemson did not add 75 ha to the community/residential land requirement in the whitebelt to accommodate land for major retail uses;</p> <p>iv) gross density of 20 units per hectare used in whitebelt lands is high; and,</p> <p>v) Differences in the assumptions used by Hemson and the Region in their analysis.</p>		
<p>175</p>	<p>DATE: June 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bell Canada</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Bell has submitted a letter requesting number of modification to various sections within the OP mainly regarding telecommunications infrastructure.</p>	<p>The City and the consultants have reviewed Bell's response and concur with the modifications to the following Sections:</p> <p>1) Section 4.2.1.6 - The inclusion of the term "utility providers" in this section.</p> <p>2) Section 8.1.2.1 - Substituting the word "required" with "request" in this section.</p> <p>3) Section 8.1.2.4 a) - Requesting the words include the term "where applicable" in this section.</p> <p>4) Section 8.4.4.2 - Requesting that the</p>	<p>1) Section 4.2.1.6 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"to implement the various improvements to the street network identified on Schedule 9 in coordination with the appropriate agencies, utility providers and adjacent municipalities and secure land for such purposes through the development approvals process, improvements include widening as per the right-of ways identified on Schedule 9, completion of incomplete grid connections such as Langstaff Road over the rail corridor, jog eliminations at intersections, new and improved</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>words replace "where possible" with "where feasible" in this section.</p> <p>5) Section 8.4.4.3 d) - Requesting the addition of the word "wireless" in this section.</p> <p>6) Section 9.2.1.10 - Requesting the addition of a policy to Section to 9.2.1, General Land Use Policies.</p> <p>7) Section 10.1.1.6 d) - Requesting that the word "municipal" be deleted from this policy.</p> <p>8) Section 10.1.1.15 - Requesting that the word "utility" be added in this section.</p>	<p>interchanges with 400-series highways and grade separated rail and highway crossings"</p> <p>2) Section 8.1.2.1 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"To request that utility providers work with the City to implement streetscape improvements and other placemaking initiatives when undertaking new utility infrastructure and development projects within public rights-of-way".</p> <p>3) Section 8.1.2.4 a) be amended as follows:</p> <p>"a) environmental assessments for infrastructure planning shall evaluate economic, social, cultural and environmental considerations in order to maximize benefits from future investments, where applicable;"</p> <p>4) Section 8.4.4.2 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"That providers shall share telecommunications and data infrastructure, where feasible, to minimize adverse impacts, including visual impacts, from wireless towers".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>5) Section 8.4.4.3 d) be amended as follows:</p> <p>"d) engaging cellular service providers early in the development process to facilitate integration of wireless telecommunications infrastructure into development;"</p> <p>6) The following policy be added to Section 9.2.1.</p> <p>"9.2.1.10 Utilities shall be permitted in all land use designations and shall be installed, where feasible, within public road allowances or within appropriate easements;"</p> <p>7) Section 10.1.1.6 d) be amended as follows:</p> <p>"d) the provision of public and private services and the detailed approach to stormwater management."</p> <p>8) Section 10.1.1.15 be amended as follows:</p> <p>"That in co-ordination with the initiation of each new phase of construction within a Block Plan Area an Infrastructure</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Phasing Plan approved by Council will identify the specific water, utility and sewer services (and sections thereof) within and external to the Block, and the arterial and collector streets (and the sections thereof) and bridge crossings which shall be constructed prior to the initiation of development in each subsequent Phase."</p>
<p>176</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: North and south of Highway 7 between Highway's 50 and 427</p>	<p>1) The depth of the "Commercial Mixed-Use" designation on the north side of Highway 7 between Highway 50 and Huntington Road is shown as approx. 50 metres deep, which has the effect of removing the intensification policies from the Woodbridge Farmers lands. They are requesting that a 200 metre depth be maintained as it was previously recognized in OPA 660.</p> <p>2) The proposed Commercial Mixed-Use designation would permit offices, hotels, retail uses and gas stations, and not to exceed 50% of total gross floor area of all uses. Landowner is concerned that</p>	<p>1) The 200m depth should be maintained to provide more site planning flexibility, and to allow more intensive uses on lands within walking distance of the future Highway 7 rapid transit corridor on the north and south side. A policy change is recommended.</p> <p>2) Commercial Mixed-Use lands are located along Primary Intensification Corridors and are intended to be developed with a variety of commercial buildings that allow for various businesses to occur in close proximity to each other, making efficient use of existing and planned transit investment.</p>	<p>1) That policy 10.2.1.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p>Boundaries of land use designations on Schedule 13 are approximate except where delineated by a Secondary Plan or area-specific policy, or where they coincide with fixed distinguishable features such as streets, utility corridors, railroads, or major natural features. For the purposes of delineating between Prestige Employment and General Employment land uses and between Commercial Mixed-Use and Prestige Employment or General Employment land uses, the use abutting an arterial</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>this would significantly reduce range of permitted uses in OPA 660. No service commercial or recreational uses would be allowed. Retail uses would only be allowed in conjunction with offices or hotel. The owner is requesting that the range of uses be significantly broadened to reflect the current policies of OPA 660 and that limitations designed to leverage office and hotels development be eliminated.</p>	<p>This policy direction is consistent with York Region Official Plan. Staff has recommended a change to this policy to reduce the minimum gross floor area devoted to uses other than retail uses from 50% to 30%.</p>	<p>street or Provincial highway shall be interpreted to extend one lot depth, up to 200 metres, in from the arterial street or Provincial highway. In all other instances, the boundaries of land use designations will be determined by a review of existing zoning by-laws; prevailing lot depths; orientation of lot frontages; lot patterns; and land use patterns. Where the intent of this Plan is maintained, minor adjustments to the boundaries will not require amendment to this Plan.</p> <p>2) Recommend that policy That Policy 9.2.2.7 (c) be amended as follows: In areas designated as Commercial Mixed-Use and located in Intensification Areas identified on Schedule 1 the zoning by-law shall require a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot to consist of uses other than retail uses.</p>
<p>177</p>	<p>DATE: June 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: York Region Condominium Corporation #945</p>	<p>1) Request existing commercial and prestige employment uses continue to be recognized as permitted uses under new "Mixed-Use Commercial" designation.</p> <p>2) Also request that the term "retail uses" be changed to "retail and service</p>	<p>1) All existing zoning permissions will be maintained on the property to implement existing use permissions. No planning justification or analysis has been submitted in support of the request.</p> <p>2) A definition for the term "retail" is proposed to be added to the Official</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) The following definition for a retail use be added to Section 10: "Retail- means retail, restaurants, and service commercial uses".</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	LOCATION: 201 Millway Ave.	commercial uses".	Plan.	
179	DATE: June 03, 2010 RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc. LOCATION: Vaughan	Request that the deadline for receiving comments on both Volumes of OP be extended to June 28, 2010.	The commenting deadlines are discussed in the covering staff report. However, staff has included comments submitted up to and including July 7, 2010 in this report.	No change is recommended.
180	DATE: June 07, 2010 RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart LOCATION: 131 and 155 Regalcrest Court	This letter raises a number of issues as follows: 1) It is unclear what the reference to "low scale" buildings refers to in Section 9.2.2.9 a). 2) Add the following to Section 9.2.2.9 a: "Areas designated as General Employment will accommodate vehicles and truck for freight handling including the pick-up, delivery and transitory storage of raw materials and good incidental to motor freight shipment directly related to the General Employment use."	1) The permitted building types and built form policies are included in Sections 9.2.2 and 9.2.3 to provide interpretation to the term "low scale". 2) The policy in Section 9.2.2.9 a) as written is sufficient to provide policy direction at an Official Plan level and interpreted to include the uses identified in the requested amendment. Specific uses are detailed in the Zoning By-law. 3) This interpretation is correct and Section 9.2.2.9 should be corrected to delete "schools" as a permitted use in an Employment Area.	1) No change is recommended. 2) No change is recommended. 3) That Section 9.2.2.9 (a) be amended to delete "schools" as a permitted use in General and Prestige Employment Areas. 4) That policy 10.2.1.4 be amended as follows: Boundaries of land use designations on Schedule 13 are approximate except where delineated by a Secondary Plan or area-specific policy, or where they

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>3) As written, Section 9.2.2.9 b) would permit schools in General Employment lands.</p> <p>4) For properties that are split designated General Employment and Prestige Employment would the General Employment uses such as transportation and outside storage be permitted on the portion of the site designated General Employment?</p> <p>5) The term "Ancillary Use" in Section 9.2.1.9 is not defined and is it necessary for the Official Plan to limit ancillary retail to 10%?</p> <p>6) Policy 9.2.1.9 c) as written is "unrealistic" and the objectives of the policy would be better designed if it required appropriate mitigation of nuisances and adverse effects on neighbouring uses.</p> <p>7) Section 9.2.1.9 d) refers to "alternative measures" being applied to achieve compatibility between uses in the "General Employment" and other land-use designation. The term "alternative measure" is not defined.</p>	<p>4) It is not intended to create "split" land designation. Therefore it is recommended that the policy in OPA 450 currently being used be included in the new Official Plan which provides for a "Prestige Employment" designation that extends one lot depth from the boundary road and detailed through the Block Plan process and By-law.</p> <p>5) The term typically is understood to be a use associated with the main use in the building. It will be defined in the implementing zoning By-law for the Official Plan.</p> <p>Ancillary retail is limited to 10% in order to protect the City's employment land from retail and commercial uses which are otherwise better located in other land use designations designed to support the urban structure proposed by the Plan.</p> <p>6) Staff has recommended a policy be included in Section 5.2.1 that would require that new adjacent land uses to prepare the appropriate environmental or noise reports to ensure the proposed use does not destabilize the industrial use.</p>	<p>coincide with fixed distinguishable features such as streets, utility corridors, railroads, or major natural features. For the purposes of delineating between Prestige Employment and General Employment land uses and between Commercial Mixed-Use and Prestige Employment or General Employment land uses, the use abutting an arterial street or Provincial highway shall be interpreted to extend one lot depth, up to 200 metres, in from the arterial street or Provincial highway. In all other instances, the boundaries of land use designations will be determined by a review of existing zoning by-laws; prevailing lot depths; orientation of lot frontages; lot patterns; and land use patterns. Where the intent of this Plan is maintained, minor adjustments to the boundaries will not require amendment to this Plan.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) Section 5.2.1 be amended by adding the following policy: "To protect Vaughan's manufacturing, industrial and warehousing sectors from potential impacts, any development or redevelopment of lands for sensitive land uses located within 500 metres of</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>8) A question is raised whether the policies of Section 9.2.3.7 apply to new buildings or are they retroactive to existing employment buildings?</p> <p>9) A request is made to amend the Prestige Employment Area policies of Section 9.2.2.10 a) to add the following text:</p> <p>“Areas designated as Prestige Employment will accommodate vehicles and truck for freight handling including the pick-up, delivery and transitory storage of raw materials and good incidental to motor freight shipment directly related to the General Prestige use.”</p> <p>10) The letter asks how the 7,500m² permissions for office uses in a Prestige Employment area are affected by the lot size.</p> <p>11) Important that policies in Section 9.2.2.19 b) do not undermine the Vaughan Marshalling Yard and private Open Storage objectives. Reference is made to the report: Implementing the Provincial “Growth Plan”: Revitalizing a Strategic Employment Area by Optimizing the Parkway Belt West lands</p>	<p>7) Alternative measures can include noise walls, building design and other measures designed to mitigate impacts to achieve compatibility between uses. The policy is sufficiently flexible to require both compliance with MOE Guidelines and to review alternatives where they may be considered appropriate.</p> <p>8) The policies will not be applied retroactively to existing buildings. A policy will be included in the Official Plan that will provide for expansion to existing buildings. Where zoning exists to permit development as-of-right and that do not comply with the new policies, the zoning permissions will remain in effect.</p> <p>9) It is not the intent of the Official plan to permit any outside storage, heavy truck operations in the Prestige Employment areas. These uses are proposed to be accommodated in the General Employment areas.</p> <p>10) Implementation of the Official Plan policies at this detail will occur in the zoning by-law, which must be enacted within 3 years of adoption of the Official Plan. Typical standards such as</p>	<p>an Employment Area, may be required to undertake appropriate environmental studies (e.g., noise, dust, vibration, etc.), to be identified on a case by case basis, in order to ensure land use compatibility with the surrounding Employment Area lands. As a result of the studies, on-site or off-site mitigation measures may be required prior to development of the sensitive land use.”</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) That the following policy be added to Section 10.2.1.3 of the Official Plan:</p> <p>To recognize legally existing land uses as they exist at the time this Plan is adopted. Such land uses shall be deemed to conform to this Plan. Minor Extensions or expansions of such uses shall be permitted without amendment to this Plan, provided that the intent of this Plan is not compromised and the tests prescribed below, are met:</p> <p>a) the road pattern and transit routes envisioned by this Plan are not compromised or precluded in the long-term;</p> <p>b) the proposed expansion or enlargement of the existing use shall not unduly aggravate the situation created</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>to permit the Vaughan Marshalling Yard.</p>	<p>maximum lot coverage, building height, landscaping requirements, etc. will control how much office space can be accommodated on any particular lot.</p> <p>11) The policies in the Official Plan will not undermine the marshalling yards. The Parkway Belt Plan recognizes land under Provincial jurisdiction and identifies infrastructure, utilities or other uses permitted under the Plan. The Official Plan includes an "Infrastructure and Utilities" designation for lands in the City with corresponding policies in Section 9.2.2.19.</p>	<p>by the existence of the use, especially in regard to the requirements of the zoning by-law;</p> <p>c) the characteristics of the existing use and the extension or enlargement shall be examined with regard to noise, vibration, fumes, smoke, dust, odor, lighting, parking and traffic generation;</p> <p>d) the neighbouring uses will be protected where necessary by the provision of landscaping, buffering or screening devices, and measures to reduce nuisances and, where necessary, by regulations for alleviating adverse effects caused by lighting or advertising signs. Such provisions and regulations shall be applied to the proposed extension or enlargement and, where feasible, shall also be extended to the existing use in order to improve its compatibility with the surrounding area; and/or,</p> <p>e) in all cases where an existing use seriously affects the amenity of the surrounding area, consideration shall be given to the possibility of ameliorating such conditions, as a condition of approving an application for extension or enlargement of the existing use, especially where public health and welfare are directly affected. This may require further discussion.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>9) No change is recommended.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p>
181	<p>DATE: June 22, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Part of Lots 23 and 24, Concession 8</p>	<p>Request the OP include policies that would allow the subject site to be developed with townhouses.</p>	<p>The lands would be designated "Low-Rise Residential" under the Official Plan which would permit townhouses as requested.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
182	<p>DATE: June 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Peter G. Mayor</p> <p>LOCATION: 340 Marc Santi Boulevard</p>	<p>The proponent is concerned that existing approvals will not be grandfathered and if the proposed natural heritage setbacks within the draft Official Plan are applied to the property they will constrain or limit development potential of the lands.</p>	<p>The draft Official Plan carries forward natural heritage system setbacks from OPA 600 and approved Block Plans.</p> <p>A concern is raised that the designation provided to the subject lands limits development opportunities. The subject lands are located in an approved Block Plan (Block 11), but the landowner was a non-participant in the Block Plan process. Most of the subject lands are in the valley and not developable.</p> <p>However, since the landowner was a non-participant in the Block Plan process, no approvals were secured on the property. The property remains zoned OSI Open Space Conservation Zone and A Agricultural Zone. The Owner will be required to submit development applications to facilitate the creation of part lots on the property to form full lots with adjacent plans of subdivision. When the applications are submitted, they will be reviewed in the context of the applicable development policies.</p>	<p>No changes is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
184	<p>DATE: June 13, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: York Region</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Urban Structure Recommend that the OP be modified in both policy and on schedules where applicable to differentiate the Regional Corridors from the remaining and subordinate Primary Intensification Corridors. The Region supports the hierarchical relationship between the “Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC)”, “Primary Centres” and “Local Centres”.</p> <p>Phasing and Sequencing Policies Recommend policies be included in the Vaughan Official Plan that clearly state an integrated phasing and sequencing approach to growth and infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>Policies should also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify key local infrastructure triggers; • define local infrastructure requirements; and • require sequencing of development within secondary plan areas. <p>Municipal Comprehensive Review To be consistent with the Regional Official Plan, and with other new local municipal Official Plans in York Region, policies referencing municipal comprehensive reviews shall indicate that they are initiated by the Region, in</p>		<p>Staff will be working with the Region to finalize the form of the policy adjustments.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>consultation with Vaughan.</p> <p>Employment Areas Recommend that the specific criteria be included in the Official Plan and also the policy statement that advises applications for employment land conversion that are not part of a five year municipal comprehensive review, are not appealable to the Ontario Municipal Board for a refusal or non-decision on the application.</p> <p>Environment Areas that need further clarification are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Natural Heritage Network Components need to be clarified and associated policies expanded; • it is recommended that the Enhancement Areas also include the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM) Natural Core and Natural Linkage Areas and the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System; • the land use designations within the Oak Ridges Moraine shown on Schedules 1 and 13 must be revised to reflect the land use designations established by the Oak Ridges Moraine 		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Conservation Plan (eg. Natural Core Areas, Natural Linkage Areas and Countryside Areas);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • numerous sections of the Greenbelt Plan need to be addressed to ensure conformity (see pages 15 and 16 in attached matrix); and • land use designations within the Greenbelt shown on Schedules 1 and 13 need to be in conformity with the Greenbelt Plan (eg. Rural or Agricultural). <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy should be included in Section 4, under Provincial Highways, that speaks to the protection of planned future Provincial highway corridors. • Schedule 10 – Transit Network, in the Vaughan Draft Official Plan shows the conceptual extension of the future Toronto-York Spadina Subway, along Jane Street, north of the planned VMC station. The reference to such an extension in policy (4.2.2.7) and as shown on Schedule 10 should be deleted. York Region's Master Transportation Plan recommends Jane 		

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>Street, from Steeles Avenue to Major Mackenzie Drive, be developed as a BRT/LRT corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 10 should also be revised with respect to identifying Rutherford Road as a Regional Transit Priority Network, and not as a Regional Rapid Transit Priority Network. 		
185	<p>DATE: July 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1931 Highway 7</p>	<p>1) Support residential designation assigned to subject property.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.2.3.1 to 9.2.3.4 imposes mandatory, numeric requirements. These policies should take form of guidelines and not absolute requirements when reviewing development applications and suggested that the language in the Official Plan be modified to accommodate this.</p> <p>3) Support Policy 4.3.2.2 that allow reduced site-specific parking requirement that recognize the need to reduce parking requirements to</p>	<p>1) Noted.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.1.2.1 provides for minor modifications to the built form policies provided they are supported by an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) The lands are zoned to permit the existing use in the lands. Also, a general policy will be included to recognize existing uses.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) Refer to number 2) in Item 25.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>encourage transit ridership.</p> <p>4) Request that a site-specific policy be added to recognize the existing use on the subject lands.</p>		
<p>186</p>	<p>DATE: July 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1929 and 1949 Highway 7</p>	<p>1) Do not support the Local Centre (Urban Structure) designation of the subject lands but supports the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation in Schedule 13-S.</p> <p>2) Request that the City not include these lands in the "Concord Centre" Secondary Plan.</p> <p>3) Request similar heights and densities permitted on the lands to the north.</p> <p>4) Built form policies 9.1.3.5 should take form as guidelines and not absolute requirements.</p> <p>5) Support Policy 4.3.2.2 that allow reduced site-specific parking requirement that recognize the need to reduce parking requirements to encourage transit ridership.</p>	<p>1) Local Centres include a range of centres from Heritage Districts to larger centres such as Carrville.</p> <p>2) Given the proximity of the lands to a potential GO Station, a Secondary Plan is required to undertake a comprehensive analysis of all relevant planning issues.</p> <p>3) The permitted heights and densities will be established through the Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>4) Flexibility in the application of the built form guidelines is provided in Policy 9.1.2.1, provided the regulated change is supported by an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City:</p> <p>5) City wide parking standards are being reviewed to implement the policies of the</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) Refer to number 2) in Item 25.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>6) Request that a site-specific policy be added to recognize the existing use on the subject lands.</p>	<p>Official Plan. Comments respecting parking standards can be facilitated through this review.</p> <p>6) A general policy will be included in the Official Plan to recognize existing uses. In addition, the existing zoning for the property protects the current permissions.</p>	
<p>187</p>	<p>DATE: July 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: City of Brampton</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>1) The plan should acknowledge the proposed GTA West Corridor identified by the Province and should incorporate corridor protection policies.</p> <p>2) The City's West Employment Area Secondary Plan should reflect more detail on urban design standards for the prestige employment areas.</p> <p>3) Various technical comments made on Schedules, Transportation (Chapter 4), Growth Management List (Chapter 1 and 2).</p>	<p>The letter was received on July 6, 2010 and may require additional review.</p> <p>1) Staff concur with this request.</p> <p>2) The West Vaughan Employment Area plan is an amendment to Volume 1. The Volume 1 policies apply.</p> <p>3) These changes will be dealt with as appropriate.</p>	<p>1) Appropriate policies will be incorporated in the Official Plan in consultation with the Region of York.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) Changes will be made as appropriate.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
190	<p>DATE: July 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 5000 King Vaughan Road</p>	<p>Request that a portion of subject land containing an existing residence be shown as Rural Residential, consistent with the adjoining lands to the east and south. Schedule 13-C currently designates the land as Agricultural.</p>	<p>A small portion of the lands at the southwest corner of the site does lie outside the Greenbelt boundary. Schedule 13-C should be amended to designate these lands Rural Residential.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 13-C to redesignate the portion of these lands at 8000 King Vaughan Rd (southwest corner) lying outside the Greenbelt boundary to "Rural Residential" and amend Schedule 1 to designate the lands as "Community Area".</p>
191	<p>DATE: July 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 5859 Rutherford Road</p>	<p>Request that land uses such as place of worship, private school, and day camp be allowed on the lands. The subject lands are designated Natural Areas, Countryside, and Core Features in draft OP.</p>	<p>The property in question is in the Core Feature designation of the Natural Heritage Network (NHN). Regionally Significant Forests and a Environmentally Sensitive Area, identified by TRCA, cover part of the property, but these identified natural areas do not include the existing building and part of the existing landscaped lot.</p> <p>An application can be submitted to modify the Core Feature boundary and designate part of the lands for an appropriate land use. Uses such as child care, school or seniors residence may not be appropriate depending on the flood limits in relation to the property.</p>	<p>Policies regarding Core Features should be modified to allow for minor modification of Core Feature boundaries. See Item #19B for details of Core Feature policies.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
192	<p>DATE: July 08, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>In addition to the letter provided on June 24, 2010, this letter includes a number of attachments respecting OMB decisions and policies of other municipalities relating to drive-throughs.</p>	<p>The OMB decisions and municipal policies provided were reviewed by staff.</p>	<p>See Recommendation under Item 134.</p>
193	<p>DATE: July 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Matthews Planning & Management Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: 212, 222, 228, 238 Steeles Avenue West</p>	<p>Reiterates concerns from attached letter dated June 22, 2010.</p> <p>1) Concerned that the parkland dedication standards are excessive.</p> <p>2) Requests additional density for the client's properties.</p>	<p>1) A number of municipalities in the GTA utilize similar parkland dedication rates as the City of Vaughan. As the City's parkland dedication rates are consistent with other municipalities in the GTA, and in accordance with requirements of the Planning Act no changes to the policies are contemplated.</p> <p>2) Noted – this request will be addressed through the Volume 2 “Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan” Committee of the Whole report that will be considered by Council on August 31, 2010.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) That this matter be resolved through the finalization of the Yonge Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan and that Official Plan (Volume 1) be amended, as required, to accommodate any necessary changes</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
195	<p>DATE: July 14, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 7242 Regional Road 27</p>	<p>1) Requesting that the provisions of Official Plan Amendment No. 584 (7242 Regional Road 27), as modified by the Ontario Municipal Board, be reflected in the new City of Vaughan Official Plan: Volume 1.</p>	<p>1) The site is subject to Official Plan Amendment 584 (OPA 584), which was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on October 27, 2004.</p> <p>OPA 584 permits the lands to be developed with offices, hotels with related hospitality, eating establishments and conference banquet hall facilities and other prestige employment uses. It also permits ancillary retail commercial uses where their orientation and location are appropriately integrated into a development that is designed and developed to the priority use.</p> <p>OPA 584 requires a detailed urban design guidelines report, master landscape plan, comprehensive phasing plan to be submitted with a site plan.</p> <p>OPA 584 calls for enhanced architectural treatment and appropriate mass and scale of buildings are to be provided reflecting the prominence of Highway 407 and Regional Road 27.</p> <p>OPA 584 identifies the height of office buildings and hotel building, and where parking is to be located.</p> <p>Given the specific development</p>	<p>1) That OPA 584 be included in Volume 2 as a site specific amendment and that Schedules 13 and 13-P be amended to incorporate OPA 584.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>requirements identified in OPA 584, and in light of the Ontario Municipal Board decision, it is suggested that this amendment be incorporated into Volume 2, as a site specific policy.</p>	
<p>196</p>	<p>DATE: July 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: South of Rutherford Road and east of Weston Road</p>	<p>Suggest that the subject lands in addition to those owned by 281187 Ontario Ltd. can be planned comprehensively.</p> <p>Request the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Designate the subject lands as a Special Study Area with site-specific policies which will require a secondary plan. 2) In the interim, permit "Prestige Employment" uses. 3) Use of suggested site-specific policy, 	<p>Staff concur that these lands should be planned comprehensively and that placing the lands into a special study area is appropriate. A recommendation has been included in the Staff Report in this respect.</p>	<p>Recommended that Schedule 14 be amended to include the lands located in the southeast quadrant of Rutherford Road, between Weston Road and Highway 400 together with the Vaughan Mills Secondary Plan Area.</p>

Attachment 1

Part B: Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		found in letter.		