

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – APRIL 3, 2012**

### **MODIFICATIONS TO THE VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN – 2010 RESPONSE TO PUBLIC, GOVERNMENT AND AGENCY SUBMISSIONS FILE 25.1**

#### **Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Planning recommends that:

1. The City of Vaughan Official Plan, Volume 1 (VOP 2010), adopted September 7, 2010, subject to the recommended modifications on September 27, 2011, be further modified by:
  - a) Deleting Policy 9.2.2.7 “Commercial Mixed-Use” replacing it with new Policies 9.2.2.7 “Employment Commercial Mixed-Use” and 9.2.2.8 “Community Commercial Mixed-Use”, as shown in Attachment 1, renumbering the rest of the section accordingly and making the corresponding schedule changes;
  - b) Replacing Policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 with the Policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 as set out in Attachment 2;
  - c) Amending Policies 9.2.2.10 “General Employment” and 9.2.2.11 “Prestige Employment” as set out in Attachment No. 3;
  - d) Amending Section 5.1.2 “Directing Economic Activity” and Section 5.2.2 “Attracting Office Uses” as set out in Attachment No. 4;
  - e) Making other changes as required throughout the document to ensure consistency with the modified policies set out in a) through d) above.
2. The Region of York be advised that the City of Vaughan is satisfied with the Provincial modifications/comments (February 1, 2012), in response to the adopted version of VOP 2010 as set out in Attachment 5, subject to the following:
  - a) That the proposed modification to Policy 9.1.2.2 (Attachment 5, p.16/23) is supported subject to the deletion of the following clause: “nor prevent changes in lot size that would enable intensification or more affordable housing, that could occur without substantially impacting the character of the neighbourhood.”
3. The Region of York be advised that the City of Vaughan is satisfied with the Region’s modifications/comments (March 14, 2012), as set out in Section 3 of this report, subject to the following:
  - a) That in respect of Region of York requested modification 4, as set out in Section 3 of this report, it is the preference of the City to not designate all lands outside of the Core Features of the Natural Heritage Network in the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine Plan Areas as “Enhancement Areas”, recognizing that the potential for enhancement in these areas is recognized in Policies 3.2.3.18 and 3.2.3.19 of the Plan and that the City will be identifying specific enhancement areas as part of the forthcoming Natural Heritage Network study.
4. The recommended responses to further modification requests to VOP 2010 originating with landowner respondents, the TRCA and City staff, as set out in Attachment 6, be approved as the City position and that such changes be incorporated into VOP 2010, as

5. modified by Council on September 27, 2012 or Volume 2 as modified by Council on March 20, 2012;
6. This report be forwarded to the Region of York as the City of Vaughan's comments and recommended modifications to VOP 2010, Volume 1 (September 27, 2012 version) for its consideration as part of the on-going review process leading to an Ontario Municipal Board Hearing.
7. City staff be authorized to work with the Region, as necessary, to finalize the necessary wording to effect the Provincial and Regional modifications, for inclusion in VOP 2010.

#### **Contribution to Sustainability**

Goal 2 of *Green Directions Vaughan*, the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan, focuses on the new Official Plan to "ensure sustainable development and redevelopment". The description of Goal 2 explains the transformative vision for the new Official Plan.

Vaughan is committed to sustainable land use. Vaughan Tomorrow, our consolidated Growth Management Strategy – 2031, has a central focus on creating a cutting-edge Official Plan that will provide for increased land use densities, efficient public transit, considerations for employment lands and open space systems, as well as walkable, human scale neighbourhoods that include services, retail, and an attractive public realm. The plan will guide the creation of the physical form that will reflect a "complete" community.

#### **Economic Impact**

The Vaughan Official Plan 2010 establishes the planning framework for development throughout the City to 2031. The Plan, when approved, will have a positive impact on the City of Vaughan in terms of managing growth and fostering retail and residential intensification and employment opportunities while fulfilling the City's obligations to conform with Provincial policies and meet Regionally imposed targets for residential and employment growth.

#### **Communications Plan**

Notice of this meeting has been communicated to the public by the following means:

- Posted on the [www.vaughan.ca](http://www.vaughan.ca) online calendar, Vaughan Tomorrow website [www.vaughantomorrow.ca](http://www.vaughantomorrow.ca), City Page Online and City Update (corporate monthly e-newsletter);
- Posted to the City's social media sites, Facebook and Twitter;
- By Canada Post to almost 1500 addresses on the Vaughan Tomorrow/Official Plan Review mailing list, updated to include the parties identified in the letters directed to the Region of York; and
- To the Official Plan Review e-mail list.

#### **Purpose**

To make recommendations on further modifications to VOP 2010 resulting from on-going analysis by staff in consideration of input from stakeholders.

## **Background – Analysis and Options**

### Location

The new Official Plan applies to all lands in the City. VOP 2010 is composed of two volumes. Volume 1 contains city-wide policies; and Volume 2 contains the secondary plans resulting from a number of focused area studies, existing area specific secondary plans that require recognition and site specific policies applicable to a number of sites or areas, which require more detailed planning policies. This report deals with a second round of proposed modifications that have emerged since the last reporting. This does not include the following Secondary Plans, which were adopted at the same time (September 7, 2010) as VOP 2010, Volumes 1 and 2. They will be the subject of future reports:

- North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan;
- Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan;
- West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan;
- Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan;
- Yonge-Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan.

In addition, the Dorian Place and Centre Street land use planning studies will be addressed individually through their respective processes.

### Status of VOP 2010, Volumes 1 and 2

In the Fall of 2010 the Region of York conducted its circulation of the Council adopted VOP 2010 to the prescribed authorities and public bodies to identify potential objections or modification requests. In addition, the Region accepted requests for modifications and Notices of Decision from the public and landowner interests, and provided the City with the originating correspondence. In order for the Region to make a decision on the approval of VOP 2010, it requested the City of Vaughan's input on the disposition of the modification requests, prior to finalizing its decision.

On September 12, 2011, a report was submitted to a Special Committee of the Whole meeting containing analyses and recommendations on approximately 120 written modification requests/submissions from landowners, public agencies and government bodies, the development industry and citizen and interest groups. Staff was directed to further address the planning merits of a number of issues raised by Committee and brought forward a second report to the Council meeting of September 27, 2011. At this meeting, Council adopted a series of modifications in response to the written submissions and staff recommendations. The Council direction has been incorporated into VOP 2010 and has been conveyed to the Region of York for its further circulation and review. The results will form the basis of a report by Regional staff to the Region's Planning and Economic Development Committee.

On February 28, 2012 a report was submitted to Committee of the Whole on Volume 2, which pertains to site and area specific plans and policies. This did not include the five secondary plans or the lands subject to the Centre Street and Dorian Place land use planning studies. The Committee of the Whole recommendations proceeded to Council for ratification on March 20, 2012.

This report to Committee of the Whole will primarily address staff recommendations on further modifications to Volume 1 that have emerged since the last report to Council on September 27, 2011. These modifications are as a result of on-going analysis by staff in consideration of input from stakeholders and the results of the Region of York's circulation process. The actions taken

by Council resulting from this report will be forwarded to the Region with the intent that they be considered in the Region's report.

The Regional report on VOP 2010 – Volume 1 may proceed to the Region's Planning and Economic Development Committee in May or June of this year. The anticipated outcome will be a consolidated version of VOP 2010 Volume 1 representing the changes to-date resulting from the on-going review process.

Staff will continue to report on modifications, as required, as the process moves toward the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing.

#### Ontario Municipal Board Appeals

The Regional Municipality of York is the approval authority for the City's Official Plan. To date, the Region is in receipt of a total of eight appeals, which have been forwarded to the Ontario Municipal Board. An initial pre-hearing conference has not been scheduled at this time.

#### Potential Impact of the Region of York Official Plan

The new Region of York Official Plan was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in September 2010. It has been appealed and the matter is now with the Ontario Municipal Board. It is anticipated that the Hearing will not commence until the Fall of this year.

Progress is being made in resolving or scoping the issues that were the basis for the appeals. Changes to the Regional Plan, as a result of the appeal process, might have a material effect on VOP 2010 as it was based on the Regional Official Plan as of the time of its approval by the Minister. If changes are required to VOP 2010 – Volume 1 they can be addressed and incorporated into the plan at a later date, through the OMB process.

#### The Recommended Modifications

The modifications discussed in this report originate from several sources. These include:

- Continuing staff evaluation of the policies of the adopted VOP 2010-Volume 1, subject to the modifications approved by Council on September 27, 2011, as result of further discussions with affected respondents in consultation with the Region of York;
- Modifications originating with the Province of Ontario as a result of the Region of York's original circulation of VOP 2010-Volume 1;
- Region of York and other agency modifications resulting from the Region's recirculation of VOP 2010-Volume 1, as modified by Council on September 27, 2011;
- Modification requests originating with respondents (landowner, developer interests); and others identified by staff for the purposes of clarification or consistency.

#### 1. Policy Modifications Resulting from Continuing Staff Evaluation

Staff has continued to evaluate potential modifications to VOP 2010 Volume 1 in light of the modifications adopted by Council on September 27, 2011, continuing input from respondents and discussions with the Region of York. On this basis Staff is prepared to recommend changes to the following policies.

##### a) **Recommended Changes to the Commercial Mixed-Use Policies**

The following change is recommended:

- Replace the "Commercial Mixed-Use" (CMU) designation with an "Employment Commercial Mixed-Use" (ECMU) designation (Policy 9.2.2.7) and a "Community

Commercial Mixed-Use” (CCMU) designation (9.2.2.8) and amend the affected schedules accordingly;

On September 27, 2012 Council approved changes to VOP 2010 Volume 1 (Policies 2.2.4.2 – 2.2.4.4) to confirm that the lands designated **Commercial Mixed-Use** in the **Employment Areas** (as shown on Schedule 1, Structure Plan) are:

- part of the Employment Area land supply for the City;
- are subject to the Employment land conversion policies of the pertinent jurisdictions; and
- the addition of residential uses and an expansion of the retail portion of the required maximum 70 percent retail to 30 percent non-retail commercial split in floor space would require a conversion through a municipal comprehensive review.

The “Commercial Mixed-Use” designation also applied to lands that were in the **Community Area** which is shown on Schedule 1, Structure Plan. Because the CMU designation would perform different functions in the **Employment Areas** and the **Community Areas**, it was determined that the best approach would be to create two separate designations – **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use (ECMU)** and **Community Commercial Mixed-Use (CCMU)**. The ECMU designation would play a major role in the **Employment Area** as a provider of supporting ancillary uses. The CCMU would be oriented to the residential community and there would be greater opportunity for retail uses. This is supported by Region of York staff.

The **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** designation would form part of the City’s Employment Area land supply. As noted, these areas are subject to the conversion policies of the Growth Plan and the Regional and City Official Plans. If residential uses or *Major Retail* uses (greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area per lot) were proposed in these areas it would constitute a conversion and need to be justified through a municipal comprehensive review. This requirement would not extend to lands under the new **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** designation as they are not part of the employment land supply. Changes in land use in the **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** designation would follow the normal process for official plan amendments.

#### *The New Employment Commercial Mixed-Use Designation*

The policies contained in the new **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** designation were derived to reflect its role in the Employment Area. The ECMU designation recognizes areas that are already predominantly commercial in nature that are located in either Intensification Corridors (Regional and Primary) or along arterial roads. The ECMU areas will have to fulfill a number of functions. This includes supporting the City’s intensification policies; contributing to the provision of ancillary uses that will primarily serve the needs of businesses and employees in the Employment Area; and providing for the largest and most comprehensive concentrations of ancillary uses in the Employment Area, including larger scale ancillary uses. The ECMU areas will also be included in the calculation of the maximum amount of land which may be devoted to ancillary uses in the Employment Areas. The latter policy is under development as part of the Regional Official Plan OMB process. The City’s policy will ultimately need to reflect what is approved in the Regional Plan.

The effect is to position the largest concentrations of supporting ancillary uses at the perimeter of the Employment Areas, thereby protecting the interior areas for

manufacturing, warehousing and processing activities. In addition, EMCU uses are typically more intensive than industrial uses. This will help support the evolution of the **Regional Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** and the **Primary Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** to transit supportive densities and pedestrian friendly environments.

In **Intensification Areas** the following uses would be permitted in the EMCU designation: Office, *Hotel*, Cultural and Entertainment Uses, *Retail* Uses (provided that no *Retail* unit shall exceed a Gross Floor Area of 3,500m<sup>2</sup>) and gas stations. *Major Retail* uses are not permitted. These include retail uses greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup> per lot, including but not limited to big box retail stores, retail warehouses and shopping centres. The same uses are permitted in non-intensification areas provided that the maximum amount of office space is capped at 12,500m<sup>2</sup> GFA. Developments in Intensification Corridors must provide for a maximum 70% retail to 30% non-retail uses floor space ratio. Permitted building types include: Low Rise Buildings (only in Non-Intensification Areas); Mid-Rise Buildings; Public and Private Institutional Buildings; and gas stations.

The recommended **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** policies are set out in Attachment No. 1.

#### *The New Community Commercial Mixed-Use Designation*

Areas designated **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** are to be located along **Regional Intensification Corridors, Primary Intensification Corridors** or abutting major arterial streets. They are predominantly commercial areas appropriate for non-residential intensification and making efficient use of existing or planned rapid transit and transit investments. These areas will assist the City in achieving its intensification objectives providing retail and commercial uses that will primarily serve the surrounding community and support the provision of population related employment.

In **Intensification Areas** the following uses would be permitted: Office, *Hotel*, Cultural and Entertainment uses, *Retail* Uses and gas stations. *Major Retail* uses are not specifically permitted. They would be subject to Policy 5.2.3.6, which permits *Major Retail* in **Regional Intensification Corridors** and **Primary Intensification Corridors**, subject to a zoning amendment fulfilling a number of criteria. *Major Retail* includes retail uses greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup> per lot including but not limited to big box retail stores, retail warehouses and shopping centres. The same uses are permitted in non-intensification areas except that the maximum amount of office is capped at 12,500m<sup>2</sup> GFA. Developments in Intensification Corridors must provide for a maximum retail to non-retail commercial use split of 70% retail to 30% non-retail uses. Permitted building types include: Low Rise Buildings (only in Non-Intensification Areas); Mid-Rise Buildings; Public and Private Institutional Buildings; and gas stations.

The recommended Community Commercial Mixed-Use Policies are set out in Attachment No. 1.

#### b) **Recommended Changes to Policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 of Section 2.2.4 “Employment Areas”**

On September 27, 2011 Council approved modifications to the policies of Section 2.2.4 to provide greater clarity as to what constituted the City’s Employment Area and its relationship to the policies contained in a number of senior level plans or policies.

Policy 2.2.4.2 specifies that the lands located in the **General Employment, Prestige Employment** and **Commercial Mixed-Use** designations constitute the City's employment land supply as defined in the Provincial Growth Plan and the PPS. In light of the recommendation to create two separate **Commercial Mixed-Use** designations, applying to Employment and Community Areas, it is further recommended that "**Commercial Mixed-Use**" be replaced with "**Employment Commercial Mixed-Use**" in this Policy. This change would also be made throughout the plan as necessary.

Policy 2.2.4.3 provides that the City's employment area land supply is subject to the conversion policies of the Provincial Growth Plan and PPS. In discussions with Region of York staff it was recommend that the other applicable policy documents, beyond the Growth Plan and the PPS, should also be cited. City staff is in agreement and it is recommend that this policy be rephrased to state that the employment land supply is subject to the conversion policies and provisions of the Planning Act, the Growth Plan, the PPS, the York Region Official Plan and this Plan (i.e. VOP 2010).

Policy 2.2.4.4 states that any proposal for additional retail permissions that exceeds the 70/30 mix of 'retail' to non-retail commercial or the addition of residential uses shall be considered a conversion and will only be permitted through a municipal comprehensive review. The 70/30 provision applies only to the areas governed by the **Commercial Mixed-Use** designation, which is recommended for replacement by the **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** designation. Region of York staff has requested a modification that would apply to all retail uses (both ancillary and accessory) currently permitted in the **Employment Area** by this Plan. The existing provision would be replaced by the following: 'any proposal for additional retail permissions that exceed the amount of retail space prescribed for the **Employment Area** by this plan or the addition of residential uses shall be considered to be a conversion under the Growth Plan . . .'. This would confirm that the level of retail uses permitted in the **Employment Area** by this Plan is the maximum amount and require that permissions for any additional retail uses would require a conversion obtained through a municipal comprehensive review.

The procedure for undertaking a municipal comprehensive review is currently being reviewed as part of the Regional Official Plan approval process. The outcome will eventually be reflected in the City's new Official Plan by way of an updated definition of municipal comprehensive review.

The revised policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 are set out in Attachment 2.

c) **Providing Greater Flexibility in the Size (Floor Area) of Office Uses in Intensification Areas and Intensification Corridors**

The following change is recommended:

- That the maximum floor area of office uses of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> on any lot in Intensification Areas outside of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre be eliminated; the size of an office use (Gross Floor Area) on a lot in the Intensification Areas be determined by the permitted Floor Space Index; and that the necessary changes in the affected land use designations and related polices be made to effect this change.

Policy 5.2.2.2 requires all *Major Office* development (greater than 12,500m<sup>2</sup> per lot) locate in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, within 500 metres of an existing or planned subway station or where permitted through a Secondary Plan.

Currently, Policy 5.2.2.3 provides that “Office uses in **Intensification Areas** will be permitted up to 12,500m<sup>2</sup> of GFA per lot with the actual permissions being reflective of the type of **Intensification Area** in which it is located, the transit service available and the surrounding context.”

It is recommended that greater flexibility be applied to this provision, which would target **Intensification Areas** for offices up to 12,500m<sup>2</sup> but permit office floor space in such areas to exceed this limit on any lot. This would provide greater flexibility for office developers looking to locate in **Intensification Areas**.

This would also address several operational issues associated with this provision. First, the maximum size restriction is a duplication of the Floor Space Index limit provided for each commercial or mixed-use parcel by VOP 2010. It already limits the amount of floor space on each lot and each assigned FSI already reflects or will reflect the hierarchy of potential office uses. In addition, the 12,500m<sup>2</sup> maximum for offices is sensitive to lot size. When lots get larger, the amount of office floor space does not increase, staying at the maximum of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> per lot, notwithstanding an increase in the total allowable floor area as a result of the application of the Floor Space Index. This could result in severance applications on larger lots in order to build more office floor space. Alternatively, in order to take advantage of the full potential granted by the assigned FSI, owners might seek approvals for other uses that may be less appropriate than office uses.

Therefore, full reliance on the Floor Space Index to regulate office uses in **Intensification Areas** is recommended. It is appropriate to “encourage” rather than “require” office uses in excess of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> per lot to locate in the **VMC**. Similarly, a maximum of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area per lot should be identified as a “target” rather than a maximum in **Intensification Areas** in order to differentiate these areas from the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**, as it will provide for the highest densities in the City.

To implement these measures, changes are required to Section 5.2.2 “Attracting Office Uses”. The changes are illustrated in Attachment 4. It is also recommended that the 12,500m<sup>2</sup> maximum should be removed from any affected designation as it applies to Intensification Areas. This will provide the City with greater flexibility in attracting a broad range of office uses to **Intensification Areas** outside the VMC, some of which may be larger than 12,500m<sup>2</sup> of GFA in size.

d) **Recommended Changes to the Office Policies in the Prestige Employment and General Employment Designations**

The following changes are recommended:

- That greater flexibility be applied to the permissions for ancillary office uses in the Prestige Employment designations;

Currently VOP 2010 – Volume 1 permits Ancillary Offices in the Prestige Employment designation, which typically means freestanding office uses not accessory to and directly associated with any of the uses permitted in that designation. The policy now provides that such uses have a maximum gross floor area per lot of 10,000m<sup>2</sup>.



There has been a request by respondents to consider adopting a greater level of flexibility in the Prestige Employment Area to permit larger ancillary office uses, especially in more prominent locations, such as along 400-series Highways, arterial intersections and in proximity to planned transit terminals. This has merit as it would provide a greater level of flexibility in attracting office users that may prefer an employment area environment.

It is recommended that the maximum floor area requirement of 10,000m<sup>2</sup> be maintained, provided that greater densities may be considered at sites located in higher profile locations, like major intersections (e.g. Arterial streets/400-series Highways), along 400-series highways or in proximity to planned transit stations. The appropriate densities will be established at the time of consideration of the implementing Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or Zoning By-law amendments.

This change is implemented through modifications to Policies 5.2.2.4 "Attracting Office Uses" (shown on Attachment No. 4) and 9.2.2.11.c.iii "Prestige Employment" (shown on Attachment No.3)

- Provide for greater flexibility in permissions for accessory office uses in the Prestige Employment and General Employment designations.

Currently VOP 2010 – Volume 1 permits Accessory Office Uses in the Prestige Employment and General Employment designations. Accessory Office means office uses directly associated with the primary permitted land use on the lot. The policy now provides that such office uses are limited to no more than 7500m<sup>2</sup> or 40% of the GFA of the primary use, whichever is greater.

The request has been received to provide greater accessory office use to accommodate users that have large combination operations, housing the primary manufacturing/warehousing component with an accompanying head office function. This is supportable.

Currently, a combination of accessory office (40%) and accessory retail uses are permitted (10%) to a maximum of 50% of the total Gross Floor Area of the primary use. To address the need for additional accessory office space it is recommended that the policy be revised to permit an increase in accessory office to 49% of the primary use on the lot. This is subject to the accessory retail and accessory office uses not exceeding a combined 49% of the gross floor area of the primary use on the lot. At no time would the accessory retail be permitted to exceed 10% of the primary use.

This will provide more opportunities for businesses that require a major office component in combination with a primary use from the industrial sector. This will make the City more attractive to users seeking sites to accommodate large-scale operations requiring jointly located head office and industrial/warehousing functions.

These changes are reflected in Policy 9.2.2.10.b.ii.B of the **General Employment** designation and Policy 9.2.2.11.c.ii.B of the **Prestige Employment** designation. They are set out in Attachment 3.

2. Modifications Originating with the Province of Ontario as a Result of the Original Circulation of VOP 2010

By letter dated February 1, 2012, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) provided comments on the adopted version of VOP 2010-Volume 1 through its "One Window" process.

The letter includes responses from the Ministries of the Environment (MOE), Transportation (MTO), Natural Resources (MNR), Infrastructure (MOI) and Tourism and Culture (MTC). The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) has requested that the Region modify the Plan to address a number of issues in order to ensure consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement and conformity with applicable Provincial policies.

Specifically, the Ministry is requesting that the Region advise as to how it intends to address a range of issues identified in the letter, including:

- Ensuring full Greenbelt Plan conformity;
- Ensure OP policies and schedules conform with the York OP, ROPA 52 and Vaughan OPA 637 as it relates to the protection of transportation corridors;
- Ensure Schedule 13, Land Use conforms with the Region of York's Schedule 8, Agricultural and Rural Areas;
- Ensure conformity with the City of Vaughan OPA 604 (Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan conformity amendment) as approved by MMAH in 2004, and
- Ensure proper recognition of the full Parkway Belt West Plan within the City of Vaughan.

The Ministry comments identify 61 areas of concern along with proposed resolutions. The detailed Provincial modifications are set out in matrix format in Attachment 5. Some of these matters might already have already been addressed by the previous modifications approved by Council on September 27, 2011. City and Region of York staff met jointly with representatives from the Ministries to review the comments and obtain a full understanding of the Provincial position. The result was that there were no substantive issues of conflict remaining.

The One Window comments contain 35 recommendations related to the Natural Areas and Countryside. These include recommendations for policies in Chapters 3, 9 and 10 as well as recommended changes to select definitions and schedules. Of the One Window comments related to the Natural Areas and Countryside, 30 recommendations have either already been addressed through previous Reports to Council or require minor technical edits. The Ministry has indicated that more attention is required to the following thematic areas in the review process with York Region:

- Conformity to ongoing changes to the York Region Official Plan resulting from the appeals process related to natural heritage system and natural feature policies, such as for woodlands and wetlands;
- Through completion of the Natural Heritage Network Study, delineating both the natural heritage system, which is the Natural Heritage Network in Vaughan as shown on Schedule 2 of the VOP 2010, as well as specific natural features (i.e. wetlands, woodlands, valleylands, etc) in appropriate schedules;
- Conformity with the York Region Official Plan and the Greenbelt Plan regarding Agricultural areas (i.e. Prime Agriculture) and Rural areas; and
- Attention to the most recent aggregate resource information that is not yet reflected in the York Region Official Plan.

Other areas of Ministry concern include:

- Identifying and adding policy language to protect Provincial transportation corridors;
- Enhancing heritage and archaeological resource policies;
- Policies on phasing, consents, and community improvement;
- Definitions and mapping changes.

Staff would like to bring two matters to Council's attention:

### **Ministry Matrix Page 9/23 – Policy 2.2.3.7 (Now Policy 2.2.3.8)**

This policy identifies an area in the north west quadrant of the city as an area for future residential development. Specifically, it applies to the triangle of land bounded by Kirby Road on the north, Huntington Road on the east and the CP Rail line on the west (DiBattista Farms Limited, Signature Developments). The site is opposite the Huntington Community of the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan area.

The Ministry advises that the Province does not support the premature identification of urban areas as it is not consistent with the PPS or the Growth Plan and is asking that the Policy be deleted from the Plan. The Region of York is taking the same position.

Staff has no objection to deleting this policy. The lands subject to this policy are now located within the GTA West Corridor Protection Zone, which protects alignment options for a 400-series Highway, by way of a development prohibition. The GTA West Corridor Individual Environmental Assessment is underway, but it could be a number of years before an alignment is refined sufficiently to assess the future of this property. Similarly, the lands to the east (the Huntington Community in the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan) are subject to the same development prohibition.

Given the uncertainty over the future of this area, both in timing of a resolution and the unknown effect of the GTA West Corridor alignment, it is considered appropriate to delete this policy.

### **Ministry Matrix Page 16/23 – Policy 9.1.1.2 of Urban Design and Built Form**

Policy 9.1.2.2 provides policy guidelines requiring that new development proposed for established residential areas be designed to reflect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area. The Ministry is proposing that this policy would benefit if it acknowledged that historical neighbourhoods, “can be receptive to policy changes without risk of loss of character, to better implement PPS policies regarding building strong communities.” It was suggested that a statement be added to 9.1.1.2 clarifying that the existing policies are not meant to discourage the incorporation of features designed to increase energy efficiency or environmental sustainability. There is no objection to this provision.

A second provision is proposed which would provide that the policies of 9.1.1.2 would not “prevent changes in lot size that would enable intensification or more affordable housing that could occur without substantially impacting the character of the neighbourhood.” On September 27, 2011 Council approved the addition of a new policy 9.1.1.3 to VOP 2010 – Volume 1, which specifically strengthened the protection of the City’s historical and older neighbourhoods, which are characteristic of the City’s founding villages. One of the primary objectives of this policy was to protect one of their defining elements, being their expansive yards and amenity areas. The policy suggested by the Ministry would result in uncertainty as to Council’s intent for the area and be subject to establishing what could potentially have a substantial impact on the character of the community. Further, VOP 2010 provides for ample opportunities for intensification. These intensification areas are typically located at the edge of communities in association with the public transit system.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Region of York be advised that the City does not support the inclusion of the second part of the policy suggested by the Ministry.

City staff is satisfied that the overall direction of the Provincial modifications is consistent with the intent of VOP 2010 – Volume 1. The proposed modifications are generally minor in nature and/or are required to address Provincial policy. Regional staff will be addressing the modifications in its

report to the Region of York Council on Volume 1 of VOP 2010, including the addition of any new policy language into Volume 1. City staff will assist as requested.

3. Modifications as a Result of the Region's Recirculation of the September 27, 2011 Council modified Version of VOP 2010 - Volume 1

Region of York

Regional staff has completed its review of the modified version of the Vaughan Official Plan (2010) that was approved by Vaughan Council on September 27, 2011 and have identified the following modifications.

1. Replace Figure 2 with the following table.

	2006	2016	2021	2026	2031
<b>Population</b>	<b>249,300</b>	<b>329,100</b>	<b>360,400</b>	<b>388,800</b>	<b>416,600</b>
<b>Employment</b>	<b>162,200</b>	<b>226,000</b>	<b>248,900</b>	<b>257,600</b>	<b>266,100</b>

**Discussion and Action:**

**The requested changes will be made as they reflect the latest population and employment numbers.**

2. Delete policy 2.2.3.8, as this policy identifies lands and future land uses beyond the 2031 scope of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

**Discussion and Action:**

**This refers to a property in the triangle of land bounded by Kirby Road on the north, Huntington Road on the east and the CP Rail line on the west (DiBattista Farms Limited, Signature Developments). The site is opposite the Huntington Community of the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan. The Province also required that this policy be deleted.**

3. Policy 2.2.4.4. Revise this policy to more generically apply to all designations within the employment areas. A conversion should be any increase in permitted retail, not just an increase from the 70/30 split.

**Discussion and Action:**

**This is addressed in Section 1. b) of this report - "Recommended Changes to Policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 of Section 2.2.4 "Employment Areas". It recommends changes that are consistent with the Region's request.**

4. Policy 3.2.3.1. Greenbelt Natural Heritage System: The Greenbelt Natural Heritage System should be identified as an enhancement area within the City of Vaughan Natural Heritage Network (NHN). While the Vaughan OP indicates (Schedule 2 and policy 3.2.3.1) that the Oak Ridges Moraine Lands and Greenbelt Lands (in their entirety) form part of the City's Natural Heritage Network (NHN), there is no greater emphasis from a natural heritage planning standpoint, placed on the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System (NHS) as a component of the City's NHN. Given the intent of the Greenbelt Plan natural heritage system as articulated within the text and policies of that plan, it is our opinion that lands not captured as Core Features of the NHN, but within the Greenbelt NHS should be identified as enhancement areas. Specifically, while the Greenbelt Plan allows for some development and site alteration, there is a requirement to *maintain, or where possible enhance*, connectivity for the movement of native plants and animals within the Greenbelt NHS. Identification of the Greenbelt NHS as an enhancement area within the City's NHN

would also be consistent with the Regional Official Plan which identified these lands as part of the Regional Greenlands System.

**Discussion and Action:**

The City agrees with the intent of the comments from the Region that lands in the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt Plan are a focus for enhancing connectivity and other aspects of ecological integrity with respect to the Natural Heritage Network. Policy 3.2.3.18 regarding the Oak Ridges Moraine Lands includes a statement that Natural Core Areas and Natural Linkage Areas, in particular, are a focus for enhancement opportunities and securement initiatives to further support Vaughan's Natural Heritage Network. Similarly, Policy 3.2.3.19 regarding Greenbelt Lands includes a statement that lands in the Natural Heritage System of the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan are a focus for enhancement opportunities and securement initiatives to further support Vaughan's Natural Heritage Network. It is also noted that the Regional Greenlands System as shown on Map 2 of the ROP is included in the Natural Areas and Countryside designation on Schedule 1 of the VOP 2010.

Staff will be embarking on the Natural Heritage Network Study shortly. One expectation of the study is to better delineate Enhancement Areas to meet ecosystem targets. Enhancement Areas are to be identified as additional candidate Core Features or areas conserved through other stewardship mechanisms depending on the proposed ecological functions of the Enhancement Area, to meet ecosystem targets.

Furthermore, agriculture is a permitted use in the Greenbelt Plan and the ORM Natural Core Area and Natural Linkage Area. Indeed, viable agriculture is promoted in the policies for these provincial Plans such that identifying whole concession blocks as Enhancement Areas on agricultural lands can be perceived to contradict policy direction in these Plans.

Hence, the City does not agree that it is necessary to identify all Greenbelt NHS lands or ORM Natural Linkage lands outside of Core Features as Enhancement Areas. The City's preference is to maintain the previous modifications to policies 3.2.3.18 and 3.2.3.19 that refer to Greenbelt Plan NHS lands and ORM Natural Core and Natural Linkage Areas as a focus for enhancement opportunities and allow for specific enhancement areas to be established through the work of the City's Natural Heritage Network study.

5. Policy 3.5.4. References rural residential uses being permitted as identified on Schedule 13. Schedule 13 does not have a land use category called rural residential.

**Discussion and Action:**

**Schedule 13 will be revised to add the reference to the "Rural Residential" designation.**

6. Schedule 1: The community areas south of Kirby Road, east of Highway 27 (Copper Creek Golf Course) should be removed and replaced with rural or agricultural area per the Greenbelt Plan.

**Discussion and Action:**

**This change will be made. It requires the removal of the "Community Area" designation where it inadvertently extends into the Greenbelt Plan Area.**

7. There is inconsistent treatment of the Skandatut lands in Block 47 on Schedules 1 and 13 with respect to those lands located within the Greenbelt Plan area. This discrepancy should be corrected.

**Discussion and Action:**

**MMAH has indicated that for lands, where an OPA was submitted prior to the Greenbelt Act/Plan, such lands are not subject to that Plan. The Block 40/47 Secondary Plan application was submitted prior to the Greenbelt Act/Plan and is therefore not subject to its provisions. The lands are also considered as part of Vaughan's "Urban Area" (in OPA 600) which was approved prior to the Greenbelt Act/Plan. Schedule 1 (Urban Structure) shows the lands within the Community Area so as to conform with the Regional Official Plan (September 7, 2010). Schedule 13 (Land Use) shows parts of the lands as "Natural Area" and "Agricultural". Once the OPA for Block 40/47 is approved "Area Specific" policies will be provided in Volume 2. Until such time, the land use designations should remain as is.**

8. Schedule 2: Per comment 4 above, the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System portion of the Regional Greenlands system should be identified as an enhancement area to ensure greater consistency with the Greenbelt Plan and the ROP.

**Discussion and Action:**

**See the response to No. 4 above.**

9. Schedule 13: Lands within the Greenbelt can only be identified as Agricultural or Rural. The Private Open Space designations in Blocks 55 (Copper Creek) and 47 should be corrected as should the low-rise residential in Block 34 west, along with any other designations other than Rural and Agricultural.

**Discussion and Action:**

**These changes will be made to reflect the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan.**

10. The following revisions should be made to Schedule 9, "Future Transportation Network":

King Vaughan Road between Huntington Road and Cold Creek Road is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

Huntington Road between Kirby Road and King Vaughan Road is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

The portion of Kirby Road between Highway 27 and Huntington Road is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

Nashville Road between Old Highway 27 and CP Rail is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

Old Highway 27 in the vicinity of Nashville Road is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

The segment of Nashville Road between Old Highway 27 and new Highway 27 is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

The segment of Teston Road between Kipling Avenue and Highway 27 is not currently under the Region's jurisdiction and should be revised.

Centre Street between Dufferin Street and Highway 7 shall be revised to indicate that it is under Provincial jurisdiction.

It is recommended that the missing link of Kirby Road between Huntington Road and Highway 27 be added to Schedule 9 and designated as a Minor Arterial Road (Vaughan).

**Discussion and Action:**

Staff are satisfied with the changes identified by the Region. The last item on the list is a recommendation that the missing link on Kirby Road between Huntington Road and Highway 27 be added to Schedule 9 and designated as a minor arterial road under Vaughan's jurisdiction. This is not supported for environmental reasons and it is not provided for under the City's Transportation Master Plan. Staff will be working to ensure that Schedule 9 correctly reflects the provisions of the Transportation Master Plan, as approved by Council. This information will be provided to the Region of York.

11. Schedule 13: change the land use designation of lands municipally known as 77 and 87 Woodstream Boulevard from "Mid-Rise Mixed Use" to "General Employment", as the Municipal Comprehensive Review recommended that these employment lands not be converted for residential purposes.

**Discussion and Action:**

On September 27, 2011 Council approved the following recommendation (in part) of the Special Committee of the Whole meeting of September 12, 2011, in respect of these properties as follows:

**"That the present Mid-Rise Mixed-Use land use designation as adopted by the City of Vaughan on September 7, 2010 be maintained for 77-87 Woodstream Boulevard with the understanding that the equivalent ground floor area of the existing banquet hall will be maintained and/or increased in the proposed development for the subject site, and that construction of a pedestrian crossover bridge which provides direct access to the school and soccer centre facility on Martin Grove Road for the community east of Rainbow Creek will also be undertaken by the developer."**

In addition, since the report, information has been provided by the applicant to clarify how the proposal might meet the requirements of the Growth Plan policies. The applicant has submitted information to address the employment land inventory issues raised by Hemson Consulting during their review and other policy issues raised by City staff. Staff has not reviewed this new information in detail to-date recognizing Council's position. Should Council wish to alter or reinforce its previous decision it may wish to adopt a resolution advising Regional Council of its position.

4. Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has requested several modifications. These have been identified and addressed in Attachment 6 under Item 560 ~~249C~~.

5. Further Modifications Originating with Requests from Landowner/Developer Interests and Staff Initiated Modifications for the Purpose of Clarification or Consistency

Modification requests continue to be received from respondents (landowner, developer interests) and staff continue to identify situations where changes to the Plan are warranted for the purposes of clarification or consistency. These are set out in matrix form in Attachment 6. It is recommended that VOP 2010 Volume 1, as modified by Council on September 27, 2012 be further modified in accordance with the recommendations set out in the matrix.

**Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020**

The new Official Plan is addressed under the objective “Plan and Manage Growth & Economic Vitality”, including the following specific initiatives:

- Complete and implement the Growth Management Strategy (Vaughan Tomorrow);
- Conduct the 5-year comprehensive review of the Official Plan as part of the Growth Management Strategy 2031;
- Support and coordinate land use planning for high capacity transit at strategic locations in the City;
- Review the Vaughan Corporate Centre Vision; and
- Prepare an employment area plan for the Vaughan Enterprise Zone and employment lands.

**Regional Implications**

This report and resulting Council minute will be forwarded to the Region of York for its consideration in the preparation of a forthcoming report on VOP 2010 – Volume 1 as part of the process leading to an Ontario Municipal Board Hearing.

**Conclusion**

It is recommended that the proposed modifications to VOP 2010 Volume 1, as modified on September 27, 2011, be approved, subject to Council input; and that this report be forwarded to the Region of York as the City’s position for the purposes of informing the Regional Planning and Development Committee report on VOP 2010 Volume 1.

Once the Regional position is confirmed, it will allow for VOP 2010 – Volume 1 to be consolidated, bringing together all modifications to-date, including those originating through the City processes, the Regional review and the Provincial and agency requests. This will assist all parties as they move toward a first pre-hearing conference on the appeals to the OMB.

The intent of the modifications to solidify the City’s position on a number of policies that were further refined, after the September 27, 2012 Council modifications, following landowner input and agency consultation. In addition, the modifications address site specific issues raised by the public and agencies and incorporate solutions that address these interests while maintaining the intent of the Plan.

However, some issues remain unresolved and new ones will emerge. Staff will continue to work with respondents and appellants in an effort to arrive at mutually acceptable solutions and report to Council as required.

Therefore, it is recommended that the recommendations of this report be adopted.



## **Attachments**

1. Recommended "Employment Commercial Mixed-Use" (9.2.2.7) and "Community Commercial Mixed-Use"(9.2.2.8) Policies;
2. Amended Policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 of Section 2.2.4 "Employment Areas";
3. Amended Policies 9.2.2.10 "General Employment "and 9.2.2.11 "Prestige Employment";
4. Amended Policies 5.1.2 "Directing Economic Activity" and 5.2.2 "Attracting Office Uses";
5. Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review";
6. Vaughan Official Plan 2010: Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations.

## **Report prepared by:**

Steven Dixon, Planner 1, x 8410  
Roy McQuillin, Manager of Policy Planning, x. 8211

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN MACKENZIE  
Commissioner of Planning

DIANA BIRCHALL  
Director of Policy Planning

/lm

**Recommendation 1a:**

**Employment Commercial Mixed Use**

9.2.2.7 In areas designated on Schedule 13 as **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use**, the following policies shall apply.

- a. Areas designated as Employment Commercial Mixed-Use are located along Regional Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas, Primary Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas or in Employment Areas abutting major arterial streets. This designation recognizes existing areas of predominately commercial uses within the Employment Area as of the adoption of this plan. Such areas are appropriate for non-residential intensification and make efficient use of existing or planned rapid transit and transit investment. These areas are planned to be developed with commercial buildings that allow for a variety of business uses to occur in close proximity to each other in order to assist the City in achieving its *intensification* objectives.
- b. **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use Areas Will:**
  - i. Support the City's intensification objectives for **Regional Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** and **Primary Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas**;
  - ii. Contribute to the provision of ancillary uses, which primarily serve the needs of businesses and employees in the **Employment Areas**;
  - iii. Provide a focus for business activity providing for the largest and most comprehensive concentrations of supporting ancillary uses and amenities in the **Employment Areas**, including larger scale ancillary uses;
  - iv. Be included in the calculation of the maximum amount of land which may be devoted to ancillary uses in the **Employment Areas** as set out in Policy x.x.x.x.;
  - v. Be carefully designed with a high standard of public realm and urban built form to contribute to the creation of an urban environment with a strong pedestrian orientation and attractive streetscapes in respect of the high profile locations of this designation;
  - v. Conform to policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4 of this Plan.
- c. The following uses shall be permitted in areas designated as **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** in addition to the uses permitted in policy 9.2.1.9:
  - i. In **Intensification Areas** as shown on Schedule 1:
    - A. Office;
    - B. *Hotel*;
    - C. Cultural and Entertainment Uses;
    - D. *Retail* Uses; provided that no *Retail* unit shall exceed a Gross Floor Area of 3,500 square meters; and Gas Stations subject to the following criteria:
      1. the use is located on an arterial street as indicated on Schedule 9;
      2. the use is limited to one gas station per intersection
      3. no gas stations shall be permitted at the intersection of two arterial streets as shown on Schedule 9.
  - ii. In non-Intensification Areas:
    - A. Office Uses to a maximum of 12,500 m<sup>2</sup> GFA per lot;
    - B. Cultural and Entertainment Uses;

- C. *Retail* Uses; provided that no *Retail* unit shall exceed a Gross Floor Area of 3,500 square metres; and Gas Stations subject to the following criteria:
  - 1. the use is located on an arterial street as indicated on Schedule 9;
  - 2. the use is limited to one gas station per intersection
  - 3. no gas stations shall be permitted at the intersection of two arterial streets as shown on Schedule 9.
- d. In **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use Areas** located in **Regional Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** and **Primary Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** as identified on Schedule 1, a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses shall consist of uses other than *retail* uses.
- e. The following building types are permitted in areas designated as **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use**:
  - i. Low Rise Buildings (only in **Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** areas not located in **Regional Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas** or **Primary Intensification Corridors within Employment Areas**);
  - ii. Mid-rise buildings;
  - iii. Public and Private Institutional Buildings;
  - iv. Gas Stations;

## Community Commercial Mixed Use

9.2.2.8 In areas designated on Schedule 13 as **Community Commercial Mixed-Use**, the following policies shall apply.

- a. Areas designated as **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** are primarily located along **Regional Intensification Corridors, Primary Intensification Corridors** or abutting major arterial streets. They shall be predominantly commercial areas appropriate for non-residential intensification and making efficient use of existing or planned rapid transit and transit investments. These areas are planned to be developed with commercial buildings that allow for a variety of business uses to occur in close proximity to each other in order to assist the City in achieving its *intensification* objectives and meeting the commercial needs of residents and businesses. These areas will be carefully designed with a high standard of architecture, urban built form and public realm and be well integrated with adjacent areas.
- b. **Community Commercial Mixed-Use Areas** will:
  - i. Provide *Retail* uses that will primarily serve the residents of the community; and
  - ii. Support the provision of Population Related Employment.
- c. The following uses shall be permitted in areas designated as **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** in addition to the uses permitted in policy 9.2.1.9:
  - i. In Intensification Areas as shown on Schedule 1:
    - A. Office Uses;
    - B. *Hotel*;
    - C. Cultural and Entertainment Uses;
    - D. *Retail* Uses; and Gas Stations subject to the following criteria:
      - 1. the use is located on an arterial street as indicated on Schedule 9;
      - 2. the use is limited to one gas station per intersection
      - 3. no gas stations shall be permitted at the intersection of two arterial streets as shown on Schedule 9.
  - ii. In a non-Intensification Areas:
    - A. Office Uses to a maximum of 12,500 m<sup>2</sup> GFA per lot;

- B. Cultural and Entertainment Uses;
- C. *Retail Uses*; and Gas Stations subject to the following criteria:
  - 1. the use is located on an arterial street as indicated on Schedule 9;
  - 2. the use is limited to one gas station per intersection
  - 3. no gas stations shall be permitted at the intersection of two arterial street as shown on Schedule 9.
- d. In **Community Commercial Mixed-Use Areas** located in **Regional Intensification Corridors** and **Primary Intensification Corridors** on Schedule 1, a minimum of 30% of the total gross floor area of all uses shall consist of uses other than *retail* uses.
- e. The following building types are permitted in areas designated as **Community Commercial Mixed-Use**:
  - i. Low-Rise Buildings (only in **Community Commercial Mixed-Use** areas not located in **Regional Intensification Corridors** or **Primary Intensification Corridors**);
  - ii. Mid-rise buildings;
  - iii. Public and Private Institutional Buildings;
  - iv. Gas Stations;

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Recommendation 1b:

- 2.2.4.2 That the lands designated **General Employment, Prestige Employment** and Employment Commercial Mixed-Use together constitutes the City's "employment area" land supply as defined in the Growth Plan and the PPS.
- 2.2.4.3 That the City's employment area land supply is subject to the conversion policies and provisions of the Planning Act, the Growth Plan, the PPS, the Region of York Official Plan and this Plan.
- 2.2.4.4 That any proposal for additional retail permissions that exceed the amount of retail space prescribed for the Employment Area by this Plan or the addition of residential uses shall be considered a conversion under the Growth Plan and will only be permitted through a *Municipal Comprehensive Review*.

\_\_\_\_\_ - added language

**Recommendation 1c:**

**General Employment**

- 9.2.2.10 In areas designated on Schedule 13 as **General Employment**, the following policies shall apply:
- a. **General Employment** areas predominantly industrial areas characterized by low scale buildings with a variety of lot sizes to provide flexibility for attracting and accommodating a wide range of industrial and associated employment uses. While areas designated as **General Employment** will continue to accommodate vehicles and trucks, development in these areas will be designed with pedestrian connectivity amenity and to serve the daily employee population and to facilitate access to public transit.
  - b. The following uses are permitted in areas designated as **General Employment**, in addition to those uses permitted through policy 9.2.1.9:
    - i. A full range of industrial uses including manufacturing, warehousing (but not a *retail warehouse*), processing, transportation, distribution, any of which may or may not include outdoor storage;
    - ii. Office and/or *retail* uses accessory to and directly associated with any of the uses listed in policy 1.1.1.1.b.i provided that:
      - A. the accessory use is located on the same lot as the primary use;
      - B. the combination of accessory office and accessory retail uses shall not exceed 49% of the total gross floor area devoted to the primary use provided that the accessory retail use is limited to no more than 10% of the total gross floor area of the primary use.
  - c. The operation of any use must not result in a nuisance or have an adverse effect on neighbouring uses by virtue of the emission or discharge of noise, vibration, particulate, odour or other irritants.
  - d. 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.
  - e. No lot within **General Employment** designated areas shall be used for the sole purpose of outside storage. Where outside storage is proposed on a lot, a building must be provided in accordance with the provisions of the City's Zoning By-Law. Notwithstanding, outside storage shall not be permitted on a corner lot.
  - f. The following Building Types are permitted in **General Employment** areas, pursuant to policies in subsection 9.2.3 of this Plan:
    - i. Employment/Industrial Buildings;
    - ii. Low-Rise Buildings; and
    - iii. Mid-Rise Buildings.

**Prestige Employment**

- 9.2.2.11 In areas designated on Schedule 13 as **Prestige Employment**, the following policies shall apply:
- a. **Prestige Employment** areas shall be characterized by high quality buildings in an attractive pedestrian-friendly, connected and transit-oriented working environment. A variety of lot sizes should be made available in areas designated as **Prestige Employment** to provide flexibility for attracting and accommodating a wide range of employment uses.
  - b. **Prestige Employment** areas shall generally be located on arterial streets forming the edges of **Employment Areas**, and along 400-series highways, in order to:

- i. allow the areas to provide a transition between **General Employment** areas and more sensitive land uses,
  - ii. locate greater intensity uses on key transportation routes, and
  - iii. provide locational opportunities for activities which require high visual exposure and an attractive working environment.
- c. The following uses are permitted in areas designated as **Prestige Employment**, in addition to those uses permitted through policy 9.2.1.9:
  - i. Industrial uses including manufacturing, warehousing (but not a *retail warehouse*), processing, and distribution uses located within wholly enclosed buildings and which do not require outside storage. Outside storage is not permitted.
  - ii. Office and or *retail* uses accessory to and directly associated with any of the uses listed in policy 1.1.1.1.c.i provided that:
    - A. the accessory use is located on the same lot as the primary use;
    - B. the combination of accessory office and accessory retail uses shall not exceed 49% of the total gross floor area devoted to the primary use provided that the accessory retail use is limited to no more than 10% of the total gross floor area of the primary use.
  - iii. Office uses not accessory to and directly associated with any of the uses listed in policy 9.2.2.11.c.i, up to a maximum gross floor area of 10,000 square metres provided that greater densities may be considered at sites located in higher profile areas such as major intersections (e.g. Arterial streets and 400-series Highways), or in proximity to planned transit stations at the time of consideration of implementing Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or Zoning By-law.
  - iv. *Ancillary retail* uses subject to the following conditions:
    - A. the gross floor area of any one *ancillary retail* unit generally shall not exceed 185 square metres;
    - B. the total gross floor area of all *ancillary retail* uses on any one lot generally shall not exceed 20% of the total gross floor area of all uses on the lot or 1,000 square metres, whichever is less; and,
    - C. the *ancillary retail* use must be located within 200 metres of the intersection of two arterial or collector streets as indicated on Schedule 9; and
  - v. Gas stations, subject to the following criteria:
    - A. the use is located on an arterial street as indicated on Schedule 9;
    - B. the use is limited to one gas station per intersection; and,
    - C. no gas stations shall be permitted at the intersection of two arterial streets as indicated on Schedule 9.
- d. The operation of any use must not result in a nuisance or have an adverse effect on neighbouring uses by virtue of the emission or discharge of noise, vibration, particulate, odour or other irritants.
- e. Separation distance guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Environment or alternative measures shall be applied to achieve compatibility between uses in the **Prestige Employment** designation and adjacent sensitive land uses.
- f. The following Building Types are permitted in **Prestige Employment** areas pursuant to policies in subsection 9.2.3 of this Plan:
  - i. Employment/Industrial Buildings;
  - ii. Low-Rise Buildings;
  - iii. Mid-Rise Buildings; and
  - iv. Gas Stations.

### Recommendation 1d:

#### 5.1.2 Directing Economic Activity

Large and accessible **Employment Areas**, for the provision of industrial, manufacturing and warehousing uses, supported Vaughan's emergence as an employment leader in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. These **Employment Areas** will continue to play a critical role in Vaughan's economic base, especially as the Highway 400 North lands and the West Vaughan Employment Area lands are developed. **Employment Areas** accommodate uses that are not appropriate in **Intensification Areas** or **Community Areas**, and are best located near Provincial highways and rail infrastructure to support efficient goods movement. To remain viable, **Employment Areas** should be maintained as large, un-fragmented areas that allow flexibility for growth and change, offer protection from more sensitive land uses and provide for a range of ancillary uses that primarily support the businesses and employees of the employment area.

Job growth outside of **Employment Areas** will occur primarily in mixed-use areas, and mostly **Intensification Areas**, due to increasingly dense populations, significant transit and infrastructure investments, and large capacity for growth. **Intensification Areas** will accommodate non-industrial employment activities that are more compatible with residential uses, and will provide opportunities to support many of Vaughan's economic sectors, such as office uses, *retail* and cultural industries.

It is the policy of Council:

- 5.1.2.1 To encourage a 20-year supply of land is designated to accommodate the forecast of 266,100 jobs as contained in the York Region Official Plan. Such lands include **Employment Areas** and **Intensification Areas**, as identified on Schedule 1.
- 5.1.2.2 To direct economic activities in a manner that supports the Growth Management Strategy set out in Chapter 2 of this plan. Specifically, industrial, manufacturing, warehousing and, where appropriate, targeted office uses should be directed to **Employment Areas**. Other economic activities, including *retail* activities and *major offices* should be directed to **Intensification Areas**, where they can be better served by transit and help create vibrant mixed-use centres and corridors.
- 5.1.2.3 To support the long-term flexibility, vitality and competitiveness of **Employment Areas** by:
  - a. maintaining **Employment Areas** as large and cohesive areas for industrial, manufacturing, warehousing and, where appropriate targeted office uses;
  - b. requiring that sensitive land-uses outside of **Employment Areas**, as defined by the Ministry of Environment Guidelines for Land-Use Compatibility, are designed and located so as not to create adverse impacts on businesses within **Employment Areas** and that such compatibility, including any required mitigation, be addressed in an Employment Area Compatibility Assessment report;
  - c. limiting *retail* uses within **Employment Areas** to *ancillary retail* uses primarily for the purposes of serving businesses and employees in the **Employment Area** while recognizing the role of Intensification Areas within Employment Areas in providing such services in greater concentrations and at higher densities;
  - d. supporting a broad mix of lot sizes that support a diversity of employment opportunities related to the primary function of **Employment Areas** to support industrial, manufacturing, warehousing and some office uses;



- e. facilitating efficient goods movement systems, in accordance with the policies in Section 4.4 of this Plan;
- f. encouraging and supporting the remediation and reuse of contaminated lands and *brownfield* sites in **Employment Areas**, in accordance with the policies of subsection 3.7.3 of this Plan; and
- g. supporting the reuse and/or repurposing of older industrial buildings and/or **Employment Areas** for cleaner and more affordable employment uses.

\_\_\_\_\_ - added language

#### Recommendation 1d:

### 5.2.2 Attracting Office Uses

Vaughan is home to a variety of office uses. Establishing a concentration of offices in any particular location or a clear pattern of office distribution is important to achieving the Growth Management strategy set out in Chapter 2 of this Plan, by directing appropriate scales of office uses to appropriate locations, supporting transit use by providing appropriate densities along transit routes and stations, and protecting **Employment Areas** for primarily industrial, manufacturing and warehousing by excluding non-accessory office uses in some areas. By permitting smaller-scale campus-style office buildings in some areas and targeting appropriately scaled offices to Intensification Areas, adjacent to planned transit stations and to other highly visible and accessible sites will help to achieve the City's intensification objective.

The emergence of the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre** creates an opportunity and need for a large office cluster around the future subway station, providing direct access to the regional labour market. *Major office* uses will be encouraged to locate in the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**, providing a mix of uses to complement the significant residential growth planned for the area. Other office uses will be encouraged in the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre** but will also be permitted in **Intensification Areas** and along arterials and transit corridors in **Employment Areas**.

It is the policy of Council:

- 5.2.2.1 To support growth in Vaughan's office sector and to direct office uses to appropriate locations in order to achieve the following objectives:
  - a. support employment and economic growth;
  - b. reinforce the growth management strategy as set out in Chapter 2 of this Plan;
  - c. achieve a transit-supportive land-use pattern and densities; and,
  - d. help create mixed-use communities within **Intensification Areas**.
- 5.2.2.2 To direct *major office* developments by:
  - a. encouraging all office uses greater than 12,500 square metres per lot to locate in the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**, within 500 metres of an existing or planned subway station, or where permitted through a Secondary Plan;
  - b. promoting the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre** as an attractive location for corporate headquarters, and Regional, Provincial and Federal government offices; and,
  - c. developing programs, incentives and partnership opportunities to attract *major office* uses and corporate headquarters to the **Vaughan Metropolitan Centre**.
- 5.2.2.3 To attract a wide variety of office uses to **Intensification Areas**, including professional, service, scientific and technical offices, and to encourage clusters of related uses to allow increased efficiency and shared support services. Office uses in

**Intensification Areas** will be targeted at facilities of up to 12,500 square metres per lot with the actual permissions being reflective of the type of **Intensification Area** in which it is located, the transit service available and the surrounding context.

- 5.2.2.4 To allow accessory office uses, directly associated with another employment use, in all **Employment Areas** and to direct any non-accessory office uses in **Employment Areas** to the **Prestige Employment or Employment Commercial Mixed-Use** designations where they will be better accessed by transit and/or accessible to the 400-series highways and arterial streets. The maximum size of a non-accessory office use in a **Prestige Employment Area** shall be 10,000 sq m., provided that sites located at higher profile locations or in proximity to planned transit stations may be considered for higher densities, at the time of consideration of a Secondary Plan, Block Plan approval and/or the implementing zoning by-law amendment.

\_\_\_\_\_ - added language

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

<b>Section/Policy</b>	<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Proposed Resolution</b>
1.5 Goals for the Official Plan	The goals of the Official Plan do not provide specific reference to the cultural heritage.	Provide a new goal, or add to one of the existing goals, which references protection of cultural heritage. For example, Goal 7 could be enhanced by adding a note with respect to adaptive re-use of older and/or historical buildings aiding the sustainable development efforts of the City of Vaughan.
2.2.3.7 Community Areas	This policy identifies a future urban area. The province does not support the premature identification of urban areas, as this is not consistent with PPS or Growth Plan policies 1.1.2 or 2.2.8 respectively.	Delete this policy from the Official Plan.
2.2.6 Parkway Belt West	The Preamble states that certain lands within the PBWP, by amendment may be removed from the plan, which is a fair statement; however, the intent of the final statement in the first paragraph is unclear.	Delete the last sentence of the preamble as these lands continue to be within the PBWP area. The statement appears to predetermine an outcome with respect to a provincial plan. Similarly, policies 2.2.6.2 and 2.2.6.3 should be deleted as there is no application to amend the Parkway Belt West Plan, at this time.
3.2.3.4 – Core features	The City’s approved OPA 604 included sand barrens, savannahs, tall grass prairies; kettle lakes; seepage areas and springs as core features in conformity with the ORMCP. Similarly, the GB Plan calls for the protection of those features.	The Region should ensure that if such features are located within Vaughan, that they be included in the list of “core features” and appropriate vpz’s be identified in the policy.
3.2.3.4 – Core Features	Sub-policy (c) Requires protection of woodlands of “local” and “provincial” significance. The OP however does not specify what criteria are considered for a woodland to be designated locally or provincially significant.	The OP should define “significance,” such a definition should include criteria that specify the minimum standards for consideration as significant. Item (c) should be clarified to indicate that the vpz be measured from the woodland’s dripline.
3.2.3.4 (e) Core Features	The GB and ORMC Plans require a minimum 30 meter VPZ for fish habitat.	Amend policy to require 30m VPZ for fish habitat within the GB and ORMC plan areas.

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
3.2.3.10 – minor modifications to Core Feature boundaries	The policy implies that “minor modification” can be made to the boundary or alignment of core features, subject to appropriate studies and approvals. This is consistent with PPS policies wherein the “no negative impact to the feature or its ecological function” is the test. However, there are some features wherein the PPS prohibits development or site alteration (i.e. PSWs and habitat of threatened and endangered species).	Clarify the policy, through modification or the addition of new policy, to state that “minor modification” is not permitted in PSW or threatened or endangered species habitat (unless so authorized by the Ministry of Natural Resources pursuant to the Endangered Species Act).
3.2.3.15 Built-Up Valley Lands	It is understood that this policy is directed at areas with existing development that are in the floodplain. The PPS prohibits new development within the floodplain, except where the area is identified as a Special Policy Area. This policy would benefit by clarifying the reference to a “secondary plan” is actually the area identified as an SPA to avoid expectations that development could occur in the other “built-up valley lands” via a secondary plan.	Amend policy to better reflect section 3.1 of the PPS and the TRCA regulations regarding existing development within the floodplain.
Section 3.3.1 – Valley and Stream Corridors	The Ministry of Environment has an interest in protecting surface water, as such coordination with the Ministry as well as the TRCA should be acknowledged in this policy section.	Please include consultation and co-ordination with the Ministry of Environment in the preamble and appropriate subsections of this policy with respect to surface water related matters.
Section 3.3.1.3 – public works within the Valley and Stream Corridor	Recognizing that public works are permitted within such corridors only where there is no alternative, this policy should require an enhanced level of storm water management associated to such works.	Consider adding a statement that requires: “Enhanced” or “Level 1” stormwater management principles, as defined in the MOE’s “Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual”
3.3.1.4 – modifications of watercourse	In addition to obtaining permissions from the TRCA regarding the modification of watercourses, this policy should also recognize the role of the MOE for such matters.	Please include the requirement for a Permit to Take Water from the MOE for modifications to watercourses where dewatering of more that 50,000 litres of water per day is expected.

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
3.3.3.1 and 3.3.3.4 – Woodlands	(See comment in letter under heading “PPS - woodlands”.)	Please review policy in context of the Regional Official Plan to ensure that woodland protection is in conformity with the ROP and clarify as appropriate.
3.3.3.4 – development in a woodland	<p>Subsection (c) permits development within a woodland subject to criteria including the woodland being a “cultural community.” MNR advises that the term “cultural” can be highly subjective and is often misapplied. Alternatively, the terms “early successional” and “young plantation” are currently used in the Greenbelt Plan and are supported with technical criteria developed to assist in their identification.</p> <p>Subsection (d) provides for removal of woodlands that are not connected to “other parts” of the system. This policy is confusing to the reader and requires clarification.</p>	<p>Consistent with policy modifications made by the Minister to the York Region Official Plan, the policy reference should be modified from “Cultural Community” to “early successional” and/or “young plantation.”<sup>3</sup></p> <p>To provide clarification to the policy, it is suggested that this section be clarified by improving Schedule 2, as noted below, wherein the system is defined by both its features and its connections.</p>
3.3.5.1 (b)	To ensure robust protection of aquatic systems, permitted development should also maintain pre-development infiltration quantities, surface water quality and groundwater quality, pursuant to section 2.2 of the PPS.	Modify the policy by adding the following to the end: “...infiltration quantities, surface water quality and groundwater quality.”
3.4.1.28 – ORMCP Major Recreational Use	The ORMCP prohibits major recreational use within Agricultural designated areas.	Include a new sub-policy wherein major recreation is prohibited in areas designated Agriculture.
3.4.1.43 (d) – Sewer and Water Services on the ORMCP	<p>The watershed plans applicable to the City of Vaughan have been completed.</p> <p>There may be other legislation that should also be consulted when preparing the water budget and conservation plan.</p>	<p>Update the policy to recognize the Humber River and Don River Watershed Plans.</p> <p>Acknowledge other legislation in the policy by adding “and other applicable legislation.”</p>

<sup>3</sup> Presently, the Region is engaged in settlement discussions with appellants of the ROP, the outcome of those discussions and the ultimate decision by the OMB may result in additional changes to this policy, including its terminology.

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
3.4.2 Greenbelt	As noted in the Greenbelt section of the staff report, a number of Greenbelt policies do not seem to be addressed in the Official Plan.	Revise applicable sections of the OP to capture the GB policies related to: existing uses, lot creation, storm water management, infrastructure, rural land use permissions, permanence of agricultural area designation, and external connections.
Policies 3.4.2.3 and 3.4.2.7 – GB NHS & PC	(See comments under “Greenbelt Plan” in attached letter.)	Delete “and existing <b>Rural Residential</b> ” from these policies.
3.4.2.10 – GB major rec. use	Per section 4.1.1 (1) of the Greenbelt Plan, subject to some exceptions, non-agricultural uses are not permitted within the lands designated Agriculture.	Recognizing that the Agricultural designation does not presently permit recreational uses, for greater clarity/certainty, it is suggested that this policy be enhanced by stating: <i>“Notwithstanding the above, major recreational uses are not permitted upon Agricultural designated lands as identified on Schedule 13 of this Plan.”</i>
3.6.1.7 Flood Hazard	This policy is missing two elements from the PPS policy 3.1.4 which should be added to ensure consistency with the PPS.	Subsection (a) should commence with “institutional uses associated with” this ensures a broader application of the policy, and provides greater direction regarding uses which are not listed but are within the same category. Subsection (b) should also include “electrical substations” as another use which is not permitted if there is a risk of not functioning during a flood event.
3.6.2.4 Flooding Hazard	This policy refers to “flood vulnerable areas” which is not a defined term in the Official Plan or in any provincial document.	To ensure that the policy is not misapplied, flood vulnerable area should be defined and/or a side bar provided that describes what constitutes such an area.
3.6.3 Special Policy Areas	This policy section refers to the “Provincial Flood Plain Planning Policy Statement” which has since been replaced by the more comprehensive Provincial Policy Statement. The City has provided a a submission to the Province to update both the mapping and policies related to the SPA.	Given that the City has prepared a submission to the Province to update SPA policy and mapping, the Region should withhold its decision on this section of the OP, as well as the related secondary plan, until the Province has approved the City’s proposed changes regarding the SPA.  Alternatively, this section of the OP could be approved with the following modifications, which are consistent with the PPS 2005, while the approval of the secondary plan is withheld subject to provincial approvals pursuant to the SPA related guidelines:

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to “Flood Plain Planning Policy” be changed to “Provincial Policy Statement”</li> <li>• Policy 3.6.3.4 be updated to reflect PPS 3.1.4 regarding prohibited uses</li> <li>• Policy 3.6.3.5 be updated to reflect PPS 3.1.3 regarding need for Ministerial approval</li> <li>• Policy 3.6.3.6 be updated to also refer to policies 3.6.3.2 and 3.6.3.3 when updating the zoning by-law.</li> </ul>
3.7.2 – Protecting Water Resources	Policy 3.7.2.9 recognizes efforts by the TRCA regarding low impact development related to stormwater management. This policy implements PPS polices regarding water quality and water quantity. It is acknowledged that section 10.1.3 identifies studies, which may be identified through pre-consultation, that are required for specific applications, however, it is through the policies of the Official Plan that the parameters for the studies are defined. As such, inclusion in this policy of the requirement for a study and its purpose would be appropriate.	To ensure implementation of this policy, the Plan should be modified to encourage developers to conduct local studies to determine which measures should be applied in which locations, to ensure successful protection and the efficient use of resources. Such studies should also include direction regarding the short and long term maintenance needs for these systems.
3.7.2.3 Erosion and Sediment Control	The MOE is responsible for providing certificates of approval related to sediment control measures.	Modify the policy to include the MOE as an agency to be consulted.
3.7.2.18 (a); 3.7.2.21; 3.7.2.24 and 3.7.2.27 – Stormwater Management	The MOE provides certificates of approval related to these matters.	Modify these policies to include the MOE as an agency to be consulted.

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
4.1.1.7 Transforming Transportation	Consistent with PPS 1.6.6 regarding protection of future transportation corridors, this policy should be enhanced to include the notion that these corridors shall be protected from development that could preclude or predetermine their development.	Insert within the policy the notion of protecting for future development of corridors when reviewing possibly premature planning applications, as well as securing lands through development approval processes.
4.2.1 – Provincial Highways	Consistent with the PPS 1.6.6 regarding planning for transportation corridors, the preamble to this section should include recognition of protecting for corridors that are presently being evaluated through an EA process and the need for co-ordination with adjacent municipalities.	Insert a new paragraph following the first one in this section, such as: <i>"The City recognizes the importance of protecting future transportation corridors as identified on Schedule 9 and their associated interchanges and access. The City also recognizes the interests of the Province and neighbouring municipalities to ensure that land use decisions and development in Vaughan does not preclude or predetermine the findings and requirements of ongoing Environmental Assessments, the potential routing of the corridor and the future location of interchanges and other accesses."</i>
4.2.1.9 Provincial Highways	<p>Consistent with the PPS, and the Regional OP, this policy requires enhancement regarding the protection of transportation corridors.</p> <p>As noted in both the Regional Official Plan and York Region's ROPA 52, the Region of York recognizes the importance of corridor protection, and the benefits of consultation with the Province for projects that may impact development of future transportation corridors. As such, this policy requires modification to better address these objectives.</p>	<p>The policy should be enhanced by referencing how alignments are to be protected, for example: <i>"To work with York Region and the Province to plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for transportation and transit facilities, as shown on Schedule 9, to meet current and projected needs and not permit development in such planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified or actively being planned. To this end, secondary plans or official plan amendments shall include more detailed official plan policy and mapping to provide corridor protection. Such amendments shall be prepared in consultation with the Region of York and the Province. Policies shall ensure that development applications neither preclude nor predetermine the above noted transportation corridors both during the Environmental Assessment process and after a final alignment is determined. Where Environmental Assessments are</i></p>



**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

		<i>being undertaken by the Province, these policies and mapping shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Province."</i>
6.1.2.1 – Cultural Heritage – Maintaining a Heritage Inventory	The Ontario Heritage Act requires municipal registers to list properties designated under Part IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), not part VI.	To be in compliance with the OHA, delete the reference to Part VI in this policy.
6.4 - Archaeological Resource Protection and Conservation	(See comments under "Cultural Heritage" in attached letter.)	Replace "on site" with "in situ" within this section.
6.4.1.1 (c)	This policy requires an Archaeological Assessment for <i>greenfield</i> development. It should be noted that redevelopment projects could also yield archaeological artefacts.	Remove the word " <i>greenfield</i> " from the policy.
6.4.1.1 (d)	This policy would benefit by providing more direction regarding archaeological assessment.	Enhance the policy by adding: " <i>Council shall require archaeological assessments conducted by archaeologists licensed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Archaeological assessment reports are to be in compliance with the guidelines set out by the Ministry of Culture, as well as licensing requirements developed under the Ontario Heritage Act. For development proposing alteration to a watercourse, a marine archaeology survey conducted by a licensed marine archaeologist may also be required.</i> "
New Policy	Presently, the OP does not provide guidance regarding development adjacent to cemeteries.	The Plan would benefit with the inclusion of a policy as follows: " <i>Council shall ensure adequate archaeological assessment and consult appropriate agencies, including the Ministry of Culture, when an identified and marked or unmarked cemetery is affected by land use development. The provisions under the Ontario Heritage Act and Cemeteries Act shall apply.</i> "

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
Section 8.2 – utilities	Policy regarding the protection of coordinated, efficient and cost effective corridors, consistent with PPS 1.6 seems to be missing from this section.	Modify this section to include a policy that addresses the need to protect for multi-functioning infrastructure corridors, especially within Greenfield and new community areas, to ensure the provision of services to accommodate expected growth.
Section 8.6 – Waste reduction	To support protection of cultural heritage properties.	Insert a policy within this section which indicates that: <i>“Council shall support the reduction of waste from construction debris as a result of the demolition of buildings by promoting and encouraging the adaptive re-use of older and existing building stock.”</i>
9.1.2.2 – Urban Design and Built Form	This policy appears to provide policy direction regarding the transition of historical built form to that which is more sustainable and in line with the policies of the Official Plan. This policy would benefit from acknowledging that historical neighbourhoods can be receptive to policy changes without risk of loss of character, to better implement PPS policies regarding building strong communities.	Include a statement at the end of this policy section, such as: <i>“The above elements are not meant to discourage the incorporation of features that can increase energy efficiency (e.g. solar configuration, solar panels) or environmental sustainability (e.g. natural lands, rainbarrels), nor prevent changes in lot size that would enable intensification or more affordable housing, that could occur without substantially impacting the character of the neighbourhood.”</i>
9.2.1.10 – General Land Use Policy	This policy identifies a number of possible secondary uses that may be permitted within utility corridors. Some of Vaughan’s utility/hydro corridors are subject to the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP), which may not permit all of the proposed secondary use, i.e. “parking lots and outdoor storage accessory to adjacent land uses.”	Modify the policy to recognize that for lands within the PBWP, the secondary use must comply with the policies of that provincial plan.
9.2.2.13 New Community Area	As noted in the attached staff report under “Ministry Assessment Growth Plan,” the PPS and Growth Plan direct that development be phased to ensure orderly development that is co-ordinated with the provision of infrastructure.	In line with the Region of York policy 5.1.8, include a policy that would require substantial completion of existing Greenfield areas prior to the registration of development within the <i>new community</i> .

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
9.2.2.13 (b) – New Community Areas	This policy references the Regional average density of 20 units per hectare for new Greenfield development to achieve 70 residents and jobs per hectare. Pursuant to the Growth Plan, the total Greenfield area for York Region is to meet a minimum of 50 residents and jobs per hectare and the Region in consultation with the lower tiers is to undertake the necessary analysis and develop the specific policies to meet that target.	The Region should modify this policy to recognize the expected minimum targets for the City of Vaughan’s new community areas, if known at this time, in order for secondary plans to be properly prepared.
9.2.2.15 (b) – Natural Areas, permitted uses	This policy is directed to public agencies and lists “farmers market” as a permitted use associated with “ecological and environmental education, conservation, protection and enhancement.” Section 40(2) of the ORMCP permits small scale commercial uses that are supportive, complementary or essential to uses permitted in the Countryside. Complementary to this policy, the Growth Plan permits economic opportunities within the rural area that serve the needs of rural residents and area businesses.	This permission should be qualified to either be limited to the Urban Area as shown on Schedule 1A or subject to meeting tests in terms of: a) serving rural community, and/or b) demonstrating that it cannot be located within the settlement area (per Growth Plan policy 2.2.2.1 (i)).
9.2.2.17 (a) and (b) Agriculture – permitted use	Policy identifying permitted and prohibited uses refers to “non-farm uses.” Non-farm is not a defined term, as such it may be more appropriate to use the term “non-agricultural use” as this is defined in the PPS.  Furthermore the PPS permits “secondary uses and agricultural uses” as well as “agricultural-related uses” in this designation; it is not clear whether policy “b” encompasses all the	Modify policy (a) by replacing the term “non-farm” with “non-agricultural”  Review policy (b) and revise as appropriate to ensure all permitted use provided in the PPS are addressed in the policy, including permission for existing residential uses.  For greater clarity, “farming and specialty farming operations” should either be defined to be consistent with the PPS policy 2.3.3.1 and definitions of “Agricultural uses, agriculture-related

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

	<p>permitted uses as provided in the PPS.</p> <p>“Farmers markets” are not permitted on agricultural designated lands per sections 2.3.3.1 of the PPS and 3.1.3 (1) of the Greenbelt Plan. The adopted York Region Official Plan only permits farmgate sales of produce or goods primarily grown or made on the farm (i.e. a secondary use as per the PPS).</p>	<p>uses and secondary uses” or revised by using the PPS terms and definitions.</p> <p>Delete “farmers market” as a permitted use, or only permit it where it meets the definition of “secondary use” as per the PPS.</p>
9.2.2.17 (c) – Agriculture, MDS	<p>The Agricultural Code of Practice has been replaced with the 2006 Minimum Distance Separation formulae which is referenced in both the PPS and provincial plans.</p>	<p>Update the policies by replacing “new farming ... of the Agricultural Code of Practice” with “<i>farm and non-farm development will comply with the Minimum Distance Separation formulae established by the Province in order to minimize odour conflicts between livestock facilities and development.</i>”</p>
9.2.2.17 (d) Agriculture – mineral aggregate extraction	<p>Policy regarding mineral aggregate resources extraction appears to be out of place within this land use designation. This policy would be more appropriately located in a general policy section of the OP under the heading “non-renewable resources”</p> <p>The PPS permits extraction within Prime Agriculture lands as an interim use and requires rehabilitation.</p>	<p>Modify policy (d) to be consistent with PPS policy 2.4.4.1 permitting extraction of minerals and petroleum resources; and 2.5.4.1 regarding extraction of mineral aggregate resources and rehabilitation in both instances.</p>
9.2.2.18 – Rural Residential	<p>The Region should assess the land use schedules in accordance with the Region’s Agricultural designation as adopted in the Regional Official Plan. Schedule 13 should be revised to be consistent with the Region’s agricultural designation.</p>	<p>If there are no lands within this designation that remain pursuant to the exercise suggested in the adjacent box, this land use designation and policy section should be removed from the Plan.</p>
10.1 – Implementation	<p>As noted in the staff report under “Ministry Assessment Growth Plan,” the PPS and Growth Plan direct that development be phased to ensure orderly development that is co-ordinated with the provision of infrastructure.</p>	<p>A new policy section regarding an overarching “phasing strategy” should be include to ensure co-ordination of phasing of development to ensure that Greenfield, UGC and intensification targets are met over the planning horizon.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Section/Policy	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
10.1.1.12 – 10.1.1.24 Block Plans	It is understood that generally the City of Vaughan uses the Block Plan approach to ensure proper co-ordination among multiple landowners when planning Greenfield areas. The Block Plan is a non-statutory tool and is more detailed than a secondary plan and is used to evaluate plans of subdivision. It is also at this stage of planning that Environmental Assessments may be undertaken, for this reason, this section would benefit by recognizing that, possible, parallel process.	This policy section, or in an otherwise suitable section of the OP, should be modified to acknowledge the linkage to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment process for collector roads or other infrastructure that is subject to the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> .
10.1.2.13 – Community Improvement Plans	Conservation of heritage resources can also be a criterion for CIPs.	Insert: “conservation of heritage resources through restoration, rehabilitation and adaptive re-use” to the list in this policy.
10.1.2.42 Consents, Countryside and Natural Areas	<p>Sub-section (b) permits severance “of sufficient size to be viable and flexible enough for agricultural uses.” The PPS provides discretion in determining appropriate minimum farm lot size, however, the Greenbelt Plan requires a minimum of 40 ha for agricultural lands. similarly, the adopted York Official Plan policy 6.3.8 (d) also establishes a minimum lot size of 40 ha.</p> <p>Sub-section (c) presently permits severances for farm retirement lots. The PPS no longer permits such severances, see PPS 2.3.4. The PPS does permit consents resulting from farm consolidation however such a consent is granted on condition that a new residence can not be located on the retained lot.</p> <p>Subsection (f) new lots for public bodies or non-profit entities are not permitted as per section 2.3.4 of the PPS, section 4.6 of the</p>	<p>Update policy (b) to require a minimum lot size of 40 ha for agricultural lands.</p> <p>Modify policy (c) by deleting the portion that refers to farm retirement lots and by inserting policy regarding no future permission for residential development on retained lots where a consent is granted resulting from farm consolidation. Recommend deleting sub-section (c)(i) as the severance is only permitted where there is an existing surplus farm residence.</p> <p>Qualify policy (f) by inserting “provided no separate lot is created” after the word “conservation.”</p>

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

	Greenbelt Plan, and section 32 of the ORMCP. Such a severance may be permitted if no new separate lot is created (i.e. easement) as per section 6.3 (8) (b) of the adopted York Region Official Plan.	
10.1.2.43 Consent – rural residential area	<p>This policy permits consent applications within the Rural Residential designation</p> <p>Per comments provided under Greenbelt Plan in the attached letter and noted regarding Schedule 13 below. There may be no lands that warrant Rural Residential Designation.</p> <p>If it is determined that there are lands that warrant the Rural Residential designation, i.e. lands that are designated Rural in the Region’s Official Plan, it should be noted that the Growth Plan limits lot division to 3 lots within the rural area.</p>	<p>Delete this section in its entirety if there are no rural lands to which it would apply.</p> <p>Modify the policy by including the limitation to 3 lots for such a consent application.</p>
<b>DEFINITIONS</b>		
Agriculture	As noted above re: policy 9.2.2.17 Agriculture, “farming and specialty farming” or alternatively “agriculture, agriculture –related and secondary uses” should be defined terms in the Official Plan	Insert appropriate terms and definitions in this section.
Archaeological potential	Policy 6.4.1.1 introduces the concept of archaeological potential, the OP would benefit by having a definition for it.	Insert a new definition, for example: “ <i>Areas of archaeological potential are determined through the use of provincial screening criteria, or criteria developed based on the known archaeological record within the City and developed by a licensed archaeologist. Such criteria include proximity to water (current and ancient shorelines), rolling topography, unusual landforms, and any locally known significant heritage areas such as portage routes or other places of past human settlement.</i> ”

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

<b>Section/Policy</b>	<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Proposed Resolution</b>
Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species	The definition provided for the habitat is limited to only those that are provided by regulation to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), whereas the PPS definition for habitat refers to: " habitat, as approved by OMNR, that is necessary for the maintenance, survival, and/or recovery of naturally occurring or reintroduced populations of endangered species, during all or any parts of its life cycle." This is significant given that the ESA definition of habitat is different from the PPS definition and the ESA regulations presently only provide the habitat description for only a few of such species.	Recognizing that the ESA regulation lists all species that are endangered, threatened or special concern but does not provide a description of each of their habitats, this definition should be modified to reflect that of the PPS. For example: <i>Habitat of endangered, threatened and special concern species are area approved by MNR which are necessary for the maintenance, survival, and/or recovery of naturally occurring or reintroduced populations of such species and where those areas of occurrence are occupied or habitually occupied by the species during all or any part(s) of its life cycle.</i>
Significance	Per comment for 3.2.3.4 – Core Features	Provide a definition for significance related to "woodlands"

<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Comment/Concern</b>	<b>Proposed Resolution</b>
Schedule 1 Urban Structure and Schedule 13 Land Use	As per comments above regarding the PBWP, the schedules presently identify only some of the Lands as PBWP.	Identify PBWP as an overlay designation and apply appropriate land use designations to the lands, i.e. utility, park, and natural area.
Schedule 1 Urban Structure	Although noted in section 2.2.3, new community areas are not shown on Schedule 1.	Identify new community areas on Schedule 1.
Schedule 1A Urban Area	Although not required by the Growth Plan, it would be useful to include the built boundary as defined by the Growth Plan Built Boundary paper on this schedule.	Identify the built boundary on Schedule 1A.
Schedule 2, Natural Heritage Network	This schedule identifies core features and enhancement areas; however, more details either on this map or subsequent maps identifying specific features i.e. PSWs,	Enhance map with specific features as per the Regional Official Plan or perhaps provide a note to this map indicating where one could find the most current information regarding where specific known features are located.

**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Schedule	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
	significant woodlands, significant valley lands, etc. would assist in implementing the natural heritage related policies of the OP.	Also, as noted above re: policy 3.3.3.4, an overlay identifying the "system" (i.e. features and their connections/linkages) as is done in the region's official plan would improve policy interpretation.
Schedule 4 ORMC and GB Plan Area and Schedule 13 Land Use	Schedule 1 of the Greenbelt Plan identifies River Valley Connections (outside of the Greenbelt) and section 3.2.5 of the Plan provides policy direction for these "external connections" where they occur within the urban areas to encourage protection and, where possible, expand these corridors.	Schedule 4 should also identify the Greenbelt Plan External Linkages, and as noted within the staff report, corresponding policy should be provided in accordance with section 3.2.5 of the Greenbelt Plan.
Schedule 5 Mineral Aggregate Resources	<p>MNDM released updated ARIP mapping for York Region 2010. The York OP was not modified to recognize the updated mapping and should not be used as a reference when evaluating this schedule.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that there are no longer any licensed aggregate extraction operations in the City of Vaughan.</p> <p>The areas shown as "Active Extraction Area" in the legend are incorrect. The designation of "Inactive Aggregate Extraction Area" is confusing given that MNR considers "inactive" operation to be currently licensed but not operational (e.g. held in reserve.) However, the designation seems to identify a collection of surrendered and abandoned site.</p>	<p>This schedule should be evaluated in the context of the 2010 ARIP. Presently there are no "primary sand and gravel deposits" but there are secondary ones which should be identified on the schedule.</p> <p>The locations shown on the map with this designation should be removed or renamed: "former aggregate extraction operation."</p> <p>We suggest removing this designation from the map or amending the legend to identify "former aggregate operation."</p>
Schedule 9 Future Transportation Network	The new Region of York Official Plan, as adopted and approved by the Minister, provides a conceptual arrow for the future GTA West transportation corridor. Schedule 9 also includes an arrow for the corridor, however, the footnote does not include similar qualifications	Modify the schedule to include qualifiers recognizing that the alignment is conceptual and that there is presently an ongoing Environmental Assessment. Modify the arrow location to be more central within the current GTA West EA Study Area. (See: <a href="http://www.gta-west.com/">http://www.gta-west.com/</a> )



**ATTACHMENT 5: Provincial Response: "City of Vaughan Original Plan One Window Review"**

## Appendix 1 – City of Vaughan Official Plan One Window Review

Schedule	Comment/Concern	Proposed Resolution
	<p>and is not consistent with the ROP in terms of location.</p> <p>There are a couple of potential road extensions/links (i.e. Kirby Road and Teston Road) which are proposed to be extended into the ORMCP and through core features.</p> <p>Also, it is noted that some of Kirby and Teston Roads are shown inconsistently on the various schedules.</p>	<p>Similar to the above, the proposed road extensions should be qualified as "conceptual and subject to an Environmental Assessment."</p> <p>Review schedules and correct as appropriate.</p>
Schedule 13 – Land Use	(See comments under "Greenbelt Plan" in attached letter.)	Redesignate lands presently shown as "Rural Residential" where they are designated as Agriculture in the Region's Official Plan.

**Attachment 6**  
**Part A: Index of Correspondence for Part B**  
**Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) – Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations**

**Attachment 6**

**Part A: Index of Correspondence for Part B**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Subject/Location</b>
I-53F	March 21, 2012	Internal	North of Steeles Avenue, east of Jane Street
168E	February 23, 2012	Rosemarie L. Humphries Humphries Planning Group Inc.	2480 Kirby Road
246B	February 27, 2012	Barry A. Horosko Bratty and Partners, LLP	7890 Bathurst Street
249C	February 07, 2012	June Little TRCA	9301 Islington Avenue Northeast corner of Rutherford Road and Islington Avenue
260D	December 02, 2011	Mark N. Emery Weston Consulting Group Inc.	Northwest corner of Steeles Avenue and Kipling Avenue
I-532B	July 04, 2011	Internal	East side of Keele Street between Highway 7 and Jardin Drive
539	September 13, 2011	Neil Palmer ARG Group Inc.	East end of Galcat Drive
I-544	January 04, 2012	Internal	7890 Pine Valley Drive Between Villa Park Drive and Royal Garden Boulevard
545	October 03, 2011	James M. Kennedy KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Yonge-Steeles Corridor/City Wide

**Attachment 6****Part A: Index of Correspondence for Part B**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Subject/Location</b>
<b>I-546</b>	January 27, 2011	Internal	4630 Langstaff Road East of Islington Avenue
<b>I-548</b>	February 08, 2012	Internal	9400-9600 Highway 27
<b>I-551</b>	March 01, 2012	Internal	Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan Area
<b>554</b>	January 20, 2012	Philip Stewart Pound & Stewart Associates Limited	Hydro Corridor east of Highway 427, between Highway 407 and Highway 7
<b>555</b>	December 12, 2011	Oz Kemal MHBC Planning	3700 Steeles Avenue West
<b>I-556</b>	November 23, 2011	Internal	9500 Dufferin Street
<b>557</b>	March 08, 2012	N. Jane Pepino Aird & Berlis LLP	7553 Islington Avenue & 150 Bruce Street

Attachment 6  
Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
I-53F	<p>DATE: March 21, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: North of Steeles Avenue, east of Jane Street</p>	<p>On March 20, 2012 Council ratified a recommendation in regard to Item 53YR2 as it respects the Steeles West Secondary Plan Area. UPS, a property owner in the secondary plan area, was concerned that there were parts of the originating OPA No. 620 missing from Section 11.3 of Volume 2 of the plan. Staff concurred and the policies are in the process of being finalized. On this basis Council approved the following recommendation:</p> <p>"That the revised version of the Steeles West Corridor Secondary Plan be incorporated into Section 11.3 of Volume 2 of VOP 2010."</p> <p>As part of the finalization exercise there will need to be a mapping reference in Volume 1 (Schedule 14-A) referring to the UPS lands referencing a specific policy applying to UPS.</p>	<p>The purpose of adding a specific policy applying to UPS is to continue the policies of OPA 620 for the UPS lands. This will allow for the continuation of the use and underlying employment designations and provide better awareness of its long-term presence in the corridor. This will ensure that sensitive land uses, which may wish to locate in their vicinity, will be required to minimize land use conflicts with the UPS operation. Recognition of the UPS site and the corresponding policy on Schedule 14-A to Volume 1 will further that objective. This will allow the reference to be included in the package of modifications to Volume 1 that will be addressed in the Region of York's forthcoming report. The specific language will be reported on at a later date for incorporation into Volume 2.</p>	<p>That Schedule 14-A to VOP 2010 be modified by identifying the UPS lands within the area shown as "Steeles West Secondary Plan" and by providing the notation: "Refer to Map 11.3.F and Policy 11.3.14.6"</p>
168E	<p>DATE: February 23, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Rosemarie L. Humphries Humphries Planning Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 2480 Kirby Road</p>	<p>Previous correspondence requested that the subject land be included within the urban boundary designation as the lands are currently municipally serviced and have land use approvals for service commercial uses inclusive of gas station and car wash, drive-thru eating establishment and motor vehicle sales and repair for farm/heavy equipment /trucks.</p> <p>A place of worship, institutional, transportation and industrial uses may also be considered for the vacant portion of the site. The balance of the</p>	<p>The existing gas bar and eating establishment were subject to City OPA 565 and ROPA 16. Given the level of previous approvals, staff can recommend that these uses be recognized, provided it does not involve an Urban Boundary Expansion. The gas bar/leaving establishment use can be recognized by policies in Section 13 of Volume 2 being shown on Schedule 14-C "Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans".</p> <p>The respondent has a current zoning approval to permit a place of worship</p>	<p>That the existing gas bar and eating establishment, as recognized in OPA 565 and Amendment 16 to the Region of York Official Plan, be recognized in Section 13 of Volume 2 and be shown on Schedule 14-C "Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans".</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>landholding is situated to the north of the developed area and south of the greenbelt boundary. VOP 2010 does not provide for agricultural-related uses and specifically states that transportation and industrial uses will not be permitted.</p>	<p>and a farm machinery/heavy equipment sales use (permitted by OPA 600) adjacent to the gas bar/eating establishment. Neither use is permitted by VOP 2010 in the Agricultural designation. The respondent is concerned that without OP recognition, the new zoning by-law will not permit these uses and the zoning rights will be lost when the new zoning by-law is enacted rendering the existing use legal non-conforming. Policy 10.2.1.4 recognizes existing uses as they exist at the time VOP 2010 is approved. It also provides for minor extensions or expansion of such uses legally existing at the time of approval of the Plan subject to a number of criteria.</p> <p>Staff believe that this is the appropriate approach. The implementing zoning by-law will not be in effect for 3-5 years providing time to take advantage of the existing zoning approvals.</p>	
<p><b>246B</b></p>	<p>DATE: February 27, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Barry A. Horosko Bratty and Partners, LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 7890 Bathurst Street</p>	<p>Land Use Schedule 13-T of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 designates the site Mid-Rise Mixed-Use with a maximum height of 12 storeys and a maximum density of a 3.5 FSI. It is requested that the height and density be increased to allow flexibility in design in achieving a high quality development.</p>	<p>The respondent has submitted an application for Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning to permit the development of two high-rise residential apartment buildings (18 storeys and 32 storeys), comprising a total of 560 apartment units connected by a 2-storey podium with recreation amenities and 1,030m<sup>2</sup> of ground floor commercial area fronting onto Bathurst Street. Any proposed modifications will be reviewed and addressed through the application process.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>These applications have proceeded to a public hearing. Until such time as the appropriate use of these lands has been determined through the application process, it is premature to amend VOP 2010.</p>	
<p><b>249C</b></p>	<p>DATE: February 07, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: June Little TRCA</p> <p>LOCATION: 9301 Islington Avenue</p> <p>Northeast corner of Rutherford Road and Islington Avenue</p>	<p>1. Two small areas to the north and east of the TRCA lands at the northeast corner of Rutherford and Islington appear to have been added in error to the Natural Heritage System. It is requested that the City include these lands within the same designation as the abutting school property (Low-Rise Mixed-Use; 1.5 FSI; Maximum height of 4 storeys).</p> <p>2. The TRCA is requesting that a further criterion be added to policy 10.1.2.18 in respect of the matters to have regard for when considering the extension or enlargement of a legal non-conforming use. In this case it is requesting that there be a reference to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act, which has provisions applying to the extension or expansion of legal non-conforming uses when they are located in the regulated floodplain.</p>	<p>1a. <u>Eastern Parcel</u></p> <p>The eastern parcel is a narrow strip of land extending west from the stoplight at Rutherford Road and the entrance to the Pierce Berton Library. It is proposed that these lands be used as a driveway access to connect to the main site west toward the Islington Avenue intersection.</p> <p>The lands are not included in either the Core Features or Enhancement Areas boundaries on Schedule 2, but are identified as Natural Areas on Schedule 13. It is not problematic to change the designation from Natural Areas to some form of development as long as the boundary is outside of the Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI), Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW) and Regionally Significant Forests. As such, the lands above the top of bank can be redesignated.</p> <p>1b. <u>Northern Parcel</u></p> <p>While the northern piece of land is identified as wetlands and meadow according to the TRCA Terrestrial Natural Heritage System, these features are not provincially significant.</p>	<p>1a. That the Eastern Parcel be designated as “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010, such that the boundary of said designation is outside of any ANSIs, PSWs and Regionally Significant Forests, and that the TRCA provide the City with the limits of the parcel in order to establish the extent of the designation; and</p> <p>1b. That the Northern Parcel of land be shown as an “Enhancement Area” on Schedule 2, and be redesignated from “Natural Areas” to “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” with an allowable height of 4 storeys and a density provision of 1.5 FSI on Schedule 13 and 13-M, and that the TRCA provide the City with a plan showing the limits of the parcel in order to establish the extent of the designations.</p> <p>2. That the first sentence of Policy 10.1.2.18 a) be modified to read:</p> <p><i>a) the characteristics of the legal non-conforming use and the proposed extension or enlargement will be examined with regard to noxious emissions including noise, vibration, fumes, smoke, dust, odour, lighting, environmental</i></p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>The wetland is not included in the finalized evaluation of the provincially significant East Humber Wetland Complex (the PSW is further to the north) or as an identified wetland.</p> <p>If not identified as a Core Feature since the wetland is neither evaluated nor identified by the MNR, it should be identified as an Enhancement Area since it is recognized by TRCA as a wetland. Recognizing the wetland as an Enhancement Area with an underlying designation of Low-Rise Mixed-Use will flag the site for appropriate studies in any Environmental Impact Study (EIS) associated with a development application and be more consistent with the way that the Core Features and Enhancement Areas have been identified. The EIS will allow for a determination of the developable area taking into consideration any environmental sensitivities.</p> <p>2. Staff has no objection to inserting a reference to the Conservation Authorities Act in Policy 10.1.2.18 a) to provide for its consideration when assessing a proposal for the extension or enlargement of a legal-non-conforming use.</p>	<p><i>impacts including consideration of Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act where the proposal is located in a regulated area and traffic generating capacity . . .</i></p>
260D	<p>DATE: December 02, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Mark N. Emery</p>	<p>In VOP 2010, the subject property is identified as part of the "Community Area" on Schedule 1 Urban Structure, but is designated "Prestige Employment" on Schedule 13 and 13-</p>	<p>1. The subject property has an area of 6.07ha (15 acres) on the north side of Steeles Avenue, between Kipling Ave and an existing 4 storey senior citizens' building to the west. Staff can confirm</p>	<p>1. That the subject lands, including the triangle of land west of the Senior Citizens' site on Steeles Avenue, be shown as "Community Area" on Schedule 1, Urban Structure; and that</p>



Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
	<p>Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest corner of Steeles Avenue and Kipling Avenue</p>	<p>Q. Request that the site be designated "Mid-Rise Residential" on Schedule 13 and 13-Q to be consistent with the "Community Area" designation on Schedule 1.</p>	<p>that the subject lands are properly shown as Community Area on Schedule 1 – Urban Structure. Originally, the lands were designated for employment uses under the previous amendment. However, in evaluating the employment land supply for the purposes of the Growth Plan and VOP 2010, this area was not included as part of the City's employment land supply. The reasons were that it was a relatively small site, it was not contiguous with any other employment area and it is surrounded by single family residential uses to the south in the City of Toronto and is abutting a sensitive land use to the west (i.e., the senior citizen's dwelling). The exclusion of this site from the employment land supply was not specifically addressed in the City's Employment Land Needs study (Hemson: 2010, 2011). Hemson Consulting has provided a letter stating that the site meets the Growth Plan tests for conversion from Employment to Non-Employment uses. This will be forwarded to the Region of York along with the confirmation that this area, including the sliver of land to the west of the Seniors' residence, should be shown as "Community Area" on Schedule 1.</p> <p>2. The respondent is further requesting that Schedules 13 and 13T be amended to designate the subject lands "Mid-Rise Residential". This area is not</p>	<p>Region of York be provided with correspondence from Hemson Consulting Inc. justifying the conversion of the subject lands to Non-Employment uses.</p> <p>2. That the subject lands be redesignated "Community Commercial Mixed-Use", without a prescribed height and density, pending the preparation of secondary plan to establish the ultimate use of the site.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>located in a Primary Intensification Corridor. Staff is of the opinion that more detailed work needs to be done to establish the appropriate land use for this site. Residential development presents a number of challenges and would have to be carefully considered. The site's location is relatively isolated and distant from the City's residential communities and their amenities. This would make it a relatively autonomous enclave, which would need on-site facilities for parks, recreation and community services and some level of retail service. Mid-Rise Residential, depending on the permitted FSI would not necessarily support the range of services that might be required to meet the needs of such a community.</p> <p>In order to establish the appropriate development of the site, staff is of the opinion that a secondary plan should be prepared for the site in accordance with the requirements of VOP 2010, especially if residential uses are proposed. This would allow for a detailed assessment of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- street and block pattern;</li> <li>- land use, heights and densities;</li> <li>- built form and urban design;</li> <li>- parks and open space requirements;</li> <li>- housing mix;</li> <li>- the provision of retail uses;</li> <li>- transportation and servicing;</li> <li>- provision of community services</li> </ul>	

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>(schools, libraries, community centres);</p> <p>- human service needs including educational, social, health and recreation.</p> <p>In order to complete the transition to Community Area, the site should receive a non-Employment designation on Schedule 13. This would clearly establish that a further conversion exercise would not be required to change the use on the site. It is recommended that the site be designated "Community Commercial Mixed-Use". The preparation of the secondary plan would allow for the determination of the ultimate use, heights and densities for the site.</p>	
<p><b>I-532B</b></p>	<p>DATE: July 04, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: East side of Keele Street between Highway 7 and Jardin Drive</p>	<p>The land use designations and policies of OPA 467 were not recognized on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010. OPA 467 redesignated the lands fronting on the east side of Keele Street between Highway 7 and Jardin Drive from "Residential Area" to "Commercial Area" to permit a range of commercial uses and provide design policies to guide the development and redevelopment of the subject lands. VOP 2010 recognizes the southeast corner of Highway 7 and Keele Street as well as the northeast corner of Jardin Drive and Keele Street, but the lots between have not been addressed to reflect OPA 467 and are now designated Low-Rise Residential in VOP 2010.</p>	<p>In order to recognize the land use policies in OPA 467, which permit business oriented uses such as offices and limited service commercial activities (not including eating establishments or retail uses), Council adopted the following recommendation on September 27, 2011:</p> <p>"That Volume 2 include a new Area Specific Policy included in Section 12 to recognize the policies under the current OPA 467 as it pertains to these lands."</p> <p>Therefore, this area should be identified as an Area Subject to Area Specific Plans on Schedule 14-B of VOP 2010.</p> <p>In order to recognize the previous</p>	<p>1. That Schedule 14-B Areas Subject to Area Specific Plans be modified to show the lands fronting the east side of Keele Street, between the property located at the southeast corner of Keele Street and Highway 7 and the property located at northeast corner of Keele Street and Jardin Drive, as an area subject to an Area Specific Plan; and that these lands be designated as "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" on Schedule 13.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>permissions, it is recommended that this area be designated as “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” on Schedule 13, subject to the policies that will be added to Section 12 of Volume 2.</p>	
<p><b>539</b></p>	<p>DATE: September 13, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Neil Palmer ARG Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: East end of Galcat Drive</p>	<p>The subject lands are located at the eastern terminus of Galcat Drive, south of an existing stormwater management pond in the southeast corner of Highway 407 and Pine Valley Drive.</p> <p>The property is subject to two current Official Plan Amendments – OPA 630 and OPA 696. Schedule 13-R of VOP 2010 accurately reflects OPA 630, however does not reflect the land use designations in OPA 696, which identifies the site as “Employment Area General”.</p>	<p>OPA 696 designates a portion of the subject property as “Employment Area General”. This should be translated onto VOP 2010 as “General Employment”.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13 and 13-R of VOP 2010 be modified to designate a portion of the lands at the east end of Galcat Drive, as identified in OPA 696, from “Infrastructure and Utilities” to “General Employment”.</p>
<p><b>I-544</b></p>	<p>DATE: January 04, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: 7890 Pine Valley Drive Between Villa Park Drive and Royal Garden Boulevard</p>	<p>The subject lands front on the west side of Pine Valley Drive, with a watercourse located on its southern boundary.</p> <p>A portion of the subject property is in the RM2 Zone and should be designated, in part, as low-rise residential in VOP 2010. However, the majority of the site is currently designated as Natural Area.</p>	<p>The southern portion of the site is zoned OS1 and should remain as part of the “Natural Areas” designation on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010. However, a portion of the RM2 Zone (on the north half of the property) has been identified as “Natural Areas” on Schedule 13 and “Natural Areas and Countryside” on Schedule 1. These schedules should be modified to “Low-Rise Residential” and “Community Area” respectively.</p>	<p>That the appropriate schedules of VOP 2010 be modified so that the portion of the subject lands currently in the RM2 Zone be designated as “Low-Rise Residential” on Schedule 13 and “Community Areas” on Schedule 1.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
545	<p>DATE: October 03, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: James M. Kennedy KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Yonge-Steeles Corridor/City Wide</p>	<p>Parkland dedication policies are too onerous for high-rise developments. Cash in lieu is the only option because there is physically not enough space to dedicate the required amount of parkland. This alternative is too costly; therefore, the parkland dedication policies should be amended to consider high density developments.</p>	<p>The City is reviewing policies for parkland dedication.</p>	<p>No change is recommended at this time.</p>
I-546	<p>DATE: January 27, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: 4630 Langstaff Road East of Islington Avenue</p>	<p>The lands at 4630 Langstaff Road, at the southern point of the Greenbelt Area on Schedule 13-M, are currently given a height and density despite having a Natural Areas designation.</p>	<p>The subject property should not have a designated height and density as it is within the Natural Areas designation of Schedule 13.</p>	<p>That the height, density and parcel boundary be removed from Schedules 13 and 13-M.</p>
I-548	<p>DATE: February 08, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: 9400-9600 Highway 27</p>	<p>The lands approximately between 9400 Highway 27 to 9600 Highway 27 (between Rutherford Road and Major Mackenzie Drive - Block 60) are designated "Valley and Stream Corridor" by OPA 601 (Kleinburg-Nashville Community Plan), and zoned A Agricultural Zone and OS1 Open Space Conservation Zone by Zoning By-law 1-88. These lands are within the floodplain.</p> <p>Schedule 2 of VOP 2010 designates the lands "Built-up Valley Lands", and Schedule 13-L in VOP 2010 designates these lands "Low-Rise Residential" for</p>	<p>The subject lands are designated as "Valley and Stream Corridor" in OPA 601, as amended by OPA 610. They have been identified on Schedule 2 of VOP 2010 as "Built-up Valley Lands" to recognize the "existing developed lands located below the physical top of bank and within the area regulated in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act", as per Section 3.2.3.16 of VOP 2010.</p> <p>The intent of the Built-up Valley Lands is to prohibit, rather than encourage "new development and/or site alteration" of previously developed</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the subject lands be designated as "Natural Areas" on Schedule 13, to reflect the approved policies of OPA 601 and OPA 610.</li> <li>2. That Schedule 13 be further modified such that the "Built-up Valley Lands" be given the appropriate land use designation on Schedule 13, as identified in an existing Official Plan Amendment and as per the Built-up Valley Land policies in Chapter 3.</li> <li>3. That the "Built-up Valley Lands" identified on Schedule 2 be modified as necessary based on the results of the</li> </ol>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>the front portion abutting Highway 27 and "Natural Areas" to the rear.</p>	<p>lands within the valley system. As such, a "Low-Density Residential" designation on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010 is not appropriate for the subject lands or other lands within the Built-up Valley Lands that have not been recognized in an approved Official Plan Amendment permitting development.</p> <p>Staff has recognized a number of inconsistencies relating to the Built-up Valley lands on Schedule 2 and the corresponding designations on Schedules 1 and 13. These will be addressed through the Natural Heritage Network Study and further review by staff.</p>	<p>forthcoming Natural Heritage Network Study and further review and analysis by staff.</p>
<p><b>I-551</b></p>	<p>DATE: March 01, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan Area</p>	<p>Schedule 14-A of VOP 2012 identifies the Kipling Avenue Secondary Plan as being within the boundary of the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan. The Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan should only extend as far west as the eastern boundary of the Kipling Avenue Secondary Plan area. This has resulted in confusion in interpreting the applicable policies for this area.</p>	<p>Section 1.1 of the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan states:</p> <p><i>The Secondary Plan generally includes the area between the east boundary of the Kipling Avenue Corridor Secondary Plan to the west, the Humber River valley and Special Policy Area (SPA) lands east of Islington to the east, Langstaff Road to the north and Regional Road 7 to the south... The Kipling Avenue area, while forming a part of the study area, is not subject to the policies of this Secondary Plan.</i></p> <p>The Kipling Avenue Corridor Secondary Plan, formerly Official Plan Amendment 695, which was approved in June 2009, remains as a stand-alone policy document. Therefore, Schedule 14-A</p>	<p>That Schedule 14-A be modified so that the boundary of the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan accurately reflects the adopted boundary, as shown on Schedule 1 of the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			should be modified so that it accurately reflects the adopted boundary of the Woodbridge Centre Secondary Plan.	
554	<p>DATE: January 20, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Philip Stewart Pound &amp; Stewart Associates Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Hydro Corridor east of Highway 427, between Highway 407 and Highway 7</p>	<p>It is requested that the City and Region consider modifying the adopted City of Vaughan Official Plan on a site specific basis to remove the Natural Areas and Countryside designations on Schedule 1, the Core Features designation on Schedule 2, and the Watercourses designation in Schedule 11 from the subject lands.</p>	<p>The respondent has submitted a Parkway Belt West Plan (PWBP) application on behalf of their clients to MMAH for a site specific amendment, in order to allow for a proposed private parking area consisting of approximately 703 spaces for tractors and trailers, as well as temporary private storage, within the hydro corridor. The application is still in process.</p> <p>The western portion of the property contains a water feature which has been identified in VOP 2010 as “Natural Areas and Countryside” within the “Parkway Belt West Lands” on Schedule 1, “Core Features” on Schedule 2, “Watercourse” on Schedule 11, and is within the “Infrastructure and Utilities” designation on Schedule 13.</p> <p>As noted by the proponent in their correspondence of January 20, 2012, appropriate assessments of the drainage features, including detailed evaluation criteria in accordance with the appropriate guidelines and standards, must be conducted before any consideration to the alteration of watercourses or natural features can occur on this site. The TRCA has been provided with a study supporting the</p>	<p>No change is recommended at this time.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>proposed adjustment to the watercourse. This review has not been completed to the satisfaction of the TRCA at this time.</p> <p>This study process is best conducted as part of the Parkway Belt application process. Until such time as the appropriate use of these lands has been determined through the application process, it is premature to amend VOP 2010. Should the application be approved and the appropriateness of a potential stream realignment be established, then the modifications to the Official Plan Schedules can be considered.</p>	
555	<p>DATE: December 12, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Oz Kemal MHBC Planning</p> <p>LOCATION: 3700 Steeles Avenue West</p>	<p>The maximum gross floor area cap on office uses of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> per lot under policy 9.2.2.7 “Commercial Mixed-Use” of VOP 2010 provides little opportunity to intensify the existing site, despite its location along a Primary Intensification Corridor and a permitted FSI of 2.5.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 1c of the covering Staff Report for comments on this issue. The report identifies changes to the “Commercial Mixed-Use” policies which would remove the maximum floor space of 12,500m<sup>2</sup> per lot, placing greater reliance on the FSI to regulate development.</p>	<p>No action is recommended on this specific request pending resolution through the recommendations of Section 1c of the Staff Report.</p>
I-556	<p>DATE: November 23, 2011</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Internal</p> <p>LOCATION: 9500 Dufferin Street</p>	<p>In Block 18, there is a previously unidentified mapping error along the west side of Dufferin Street, east of Grand Trunk Avenue, north of the Carville Secondary Plan Area and south of Princess Isabella Court. The subject lands do not have a municipal frontage, but were severed from 9500 Dufferin Street and are directly west of that site. The lands have been identified on</p>	<p>The subject lands are identified as Valley/Open Space and Woodlot in the approved Block Plan for Block 18, and were assessed to have moderate environmental function. In 2001, Council enacted a by-law to implement the protection of tableland woodlands within the urban villages of Vellore and Carrville, providing for the complete preservation of woodlots.</p>	<p>That the subject lands be designated “Natural Areas and Countryside” on Schedule 1, “Core Features” on Schedule 2 and “Natural Areas” on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010.</p>



Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>Schedule 2 as an “Enhancement Area”, but are identified as “Community Area” on Schedule 1 and “Low-Rise Residential” on Schedule 13; they should instead be reflected as “Natural Areas and Countryside” on Schedule 1, “Natural Areas” on Schedule 13, and “Core Features” on Schedule 2.</p>	<p>On September 25, 2003, the Ontario Municipal Board dismissed an appeal by the land owners against said by-law, noting that the classification of the woodlot was based on ecological functions and that the woodlot is in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area – which prohibits development or site alteration of key natural heritage features, including significant woodlots – and is designated as a significant woodlot on Schedule 24 of OPA 604, which was passed by the City of Vaughan to bring the Official Plan into conformity with the ORMCP.</p> <p>As such, a “Natural Areas” designation was initially given to the subject property on Schedules 13 of VOP 2010. However, the site was inadvertently shown as “Low-Rise Residential”, which may have occurred due to the same designation being applied to the adjacent school site (located to the east of the subject lands).</p> <p>The subject property is shown as “Enhancement Area” on Schedule 2 of VOP 2010. An Ontario Court of Justice ruling on January 28, 2005 ordered the replanting of trees and shrubs, which had been illegally removed from the site, at the expense of the land owner.</p> <p>Technical Paper 7 of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan addresses the effect of tree removal on the status of significant woodlands in stating:</p>	

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p><i>Except where permanent removal is permitted in accordance with the ORMCP, a woodland considered significant on or after November 17, 2001 should continue to be identified and managed as a key natural heritage feature in accordance with the policies of the ORMCP even if trees are removed or destroyed due to human or natural causes. Such removal ... shall not constitute a reduction in size or outer boundaries of the significant woodland for land use planning purposes.</i></p> <p>As such, it is appropriate and recommended that the subject lands be designated as "Natural Areas and Countryside" on Schedule 1, "Core Features" on Schedule 2 and "Natural Areas" on Schedule 13.</p>	
557	<p>DATE: March 08, 2012</p> <p>RESPONDENT: N. Jane Pepino Aird &amp; Berlis LLP</p> <p>LOCATION: 7553 Islington Avenue &amp; 150 Bruce Street</p>	<p>VOP 2010 designates the subject property Natural Areas in accordance with Schedule 13 Land Use. The Natural Areas designation will not permit the proposed development of the subject property.</p> <p>The respondent is requesting that the Natural Areas designation be replaced with a High-Rise Residential designation.</p>	<p>In 2008, the owner of the subject property submitted an Official Plan Amendment Application specifically to amend OPA 240 to redesignate the subject lands from "Open Space" and "Low Density Residential" to "High Density Residential" to facilitate the development of two 22-storey residential towers linked by a 5-storey podium building, with 632 residential units, a Floor Space Index of 3.5 and 890 parking spaces.</p> <p>The application proceeded to a public hearing in March 2009, at which time a number of issues were identified in the</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 6

Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) - Summary of Further Modifications, Comments and Recommendations

Item	Submission	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>review of the application, including the requirements and policies of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, the appropriateness of the proposed development, surrounding land uses, environmental considerations, and potential impacts on the surrounding road network and municipal infrastructure.</p> <p>The application has not proceeded to a Committee of the Whole meeting for a technical report.</p> <p>The current Zoning of the subject lands along Islington Avenue is OS1, which does not permit any buildings or structures other than for conservation or flood control projects. OPA 240 currently designates the site Open Space, which permits community parks, neighbourhood parks, and pedestrian-bicycle linkways.</p> <p>The subject site is located within the Humber River floodplain and hazard area as identified in the TRCA regulation area, and has therefore been identified as “Natural Areas” on Schedule 13 of VOP 2010.</p> <p>No further justification has been provided to support a change to the land use designations on VOP 2010. Therefore no change is recommended.</p>	