Recommendation

The Commissioner of Planning recommends that:

1. The City of Vaughan Official Plan, Volume 2 (VOP 2010), adopted September 7, 2010 be modified in accordance with the recommendations set out in Attachment No. 1 to this report.

2. This report be forwarded to the Region of York as the City of Vaughan’s recommended modifications to VOP 2010, Volume 2 for its consideration as part of the ongoing review process leading to an Ontario Municipal Board Hearing on 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 online calendar, Vaughan Tomorrow website 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 indentified in the letters directed to the Region of York; and
- By email to nearly 1300 email addresses on the Official Plan Review e-mail list.
Purpose

To report on and obtain direction on requested modifications to VOP 2010, Volume 2 that have been identified since its adoption on September 7, 2010. The Council ratified report and recommended modifications will be forwarded to the Regional Municipality of York with the request that the modifications be incorporated into Volume 2 of VOP 2010 as part of the official plan approval process.

Background - Analysis and Options

Location

The new Official Plan applies to all lands within 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 Volume 2 of VOP 2010.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010

The Official Plan introduces a set of land use designations applicable to lands throughout Vaughan. It includes an enlarged series of land use maps for each part of the City, enabling the reader to more clearly understand the detailed land use information presented thereon, including the maximum permitted heights and densities. Volume 2 of VOP 2010 includes Secondary Plan policies, area specific policies and site specific policies for lands identified on Schedule 14-A (Areas Subject to Secondary Plans), 14-B (Areas Subject to Area Specific Plans) and 14-C (Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans), respectively. These areas have been identified as areas needing more specific guidance than is provided for in Volume 1.

In addition, the five focus area Secondary Plans are part of Volume 2. These Secondary Plans were also adopted on September 7, 2010. They are the:

- 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

The Secondary Plans will be subject to separate reports on further modifications in the near future. There are also eight Required Secondary Plan Areas identified on Schedule 14-A that are not addressed in this report, and will be subject to separate reports in the future. They are:

- Vaughan Mills Centre
- Weston Road and Highway 7
- Concord Centre
- New Community Areas (Block 41 & 27)
- Jane Street and Major Mackenzie Drive
- Dufferin Street and Centre Street
- Promenade Mall
- Maple GO Station

In addition, this report does not address the issues raised pertaining to Centre Street and Dorian Place in Thornhill. These areas are subject to separate studies and will be addressed through those processes.
Status of Volume 1

Previous Council Action

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 both 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 on September 27, 2011. At this meeting, Council adopted a series of modifications in response to the written submissions and staff recommendations. Council direction has been incorporated into VOP 2010 Volume 1 and this has been conveyed to the Region of York for further circulation and review.

Appeals

The Regional Municipality of York is the approval authority for the City's Official Plan. As approval authority, the Region would normally issue a Notice of Decision on VOP 2010. However, VOP 2010 has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. The Region is in receipt of a total of six appeals to date and has forwarded the file to the Ontario Municipal Board. The Board has confirmed its assumption of the matter by letter, dated January 4, 2012. Therefore, the Board is now the approval authority for VOP 2010.

Staff will continue to report on modifications to VOP 2010 and the other parts of the Plan. The modifications to Volume 2 resulting from this report will be forwarded to the Region of York for its consideration in the approval process.

Once the Region's follow-up circulation is completed, Regional staff will report to Regional Council on the City's recommended modifications and changes resulting from its circulation process. It is expected that the Region's modifications would be incorporated into VOP 2010 and form the basis for a consolidated version that would represent a public sector (City, Region, agencies, Provincial Ministries) consensus version of the Plan.

Future Reporting on Volume 1

Staff is planning to provide a further report on Volume 1 matters. The intention is to report to Committee of the Whole in advance of the Region's report on VOP 2010 - Volume 1. This will allow Regional Council to have the benefit of Vaughan Council's position on a number of matters prior to its consideration of Volume 1 and the Council approved modifications of September 27, 2011. The following matters will be addressed in this report:

- Further modifications to VOP 2010 emerging from continuing staff evaluation of the policies of the adopted VOP 2010-Volume 1, as modified by Council on September 27, 2012, as a result of discussions with affected respondents;
- Proposed modifications originating from the Province of Ontario as a result of the Region of York's original circulation of VOP 2010-Volume 1;
• Proposed 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;
• Other modifications identified by staff for the purposes of clarification or consistency, including mapping changes.

This report is anticipated for April of 2012.

Approval Process for VOP 2010 Volume 2

As is the case with Volume 1 of VOP 2010, the Regional Municipality of York is no longer the approval authority for Volume 2 of the City’s Official Plan. This report outlines the City’s responses to the originating correspondence for Volume 2 that were derived from the Region’s circulation process from 2010. In addition to addressing modification requests emerging from the Region’s process, this report will also address changes to policy that have been identified by staff, which will serve to clarify the plan. Similarly, staff will also make recommendations on additional changes to the mapping schedules that have been identified by both the public and staff that will serve to improve their accuracy and usability.

Upon receiving Council direction on the modifications, this report and the Council minutes will be forwarded to the Region as the City’s position. This will include the rewriting of the sections of Volume 2 dealing with a number of Secondary Plan areas to incorporate changes resulting from Regional and OMB Appeals. This will allow Regional staff to complete their analysis of Volume 2.

Analysis of Submissions

Staff reviewed approximately 120 written submissions emerging from the original circulation of VOP 2010. Of these, some pertained specifically to Volume 2 which were deferred by Council on September 27, 2011, to the Volume 2 report.

In analyzing the Volume 2 submissions and preparing recommendations, a number of objectives were taken into consideration. These included maintaining the principles of the new Official Plan, ensuring continuing conformity with senior level policy direction (e.g., the Regional OP and the Places to Grow plan) and ensuring adherence to sound planning principles.

Each modification request was considered on its merits and where necessary, recommendations have been provided on appropriate responses and actions. In addition, staff has identified areas where changes should be made to the plan. Such City initiated changes will also need to be considered and incorporated.

To ensure an efficient and thorough analysis, staff established a template for the evaluation of each written submission. The template forms the basis for Attachment No. 1, which sets out the recommended responses. Also attached, forming Attachment No. 2, is the originating correspondence. Each piece of correspondence in Attachment No. 2 is referenced by an item number to correspond with the response in Attachment No. 1 to allow for a detailed review of the source material. This has been posted on the City’s website and is available for review in the City of Vaughan Clerk’s Department.

The Review Template

The responses in Attachment No. 1 are presented in matrix form in the following manner:

Part A: Index of Correspondence for Part B identifying each respondent by way of:
• An Item number;
• The Submission Date of the originating correspondence;
Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 2) - Summary of Respondents Requests/ Staff Comments and Recommendations setting out:

- The Name of the respondent;
- The Subject/Location.

Previous Council Consideration of Volume 2 Modifications

It is noted that Council directed a number of modifications to Volume 2 on September 27, 2011. For the purposes of creating a comprehensive and consolidated record of City-action, the previous Council modifications have been included in Attachment No. 1.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

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

The new City of Vaughan Official Plan was prepared in consultation with Region of York staff. The Regional Official Plan was adopted in December 2009 and was approved by the Province on September 7, 2010. However, the Regional Official Plan has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. Mediation is now underway and City staff is monitoring the process. It is anticipated that a hearing may commence in the Fall, 2012. The City’s Official Plan has been designed to conform to the Regional Official Plan as approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Any changes resulting from the Ontario Municipal Board’s decision on the Regional Official Plan will have to be reflected in the City’s Plan.

Next Steps

Upon ratification by Council, this report along with the pertinent Council minute will be forwarded to the Region of York as the City’s response to the requested modifications to Volume 2. This will allow the Region to continue its review of VOP 2010. As VOP 2010 has been appealed to the OMB, the Region is no longer the approval authority. Receipt of this report will allow the Region to review the City’s response and establish its position on these recommended modifications and on others originating from any subsequent recirculation undertaken by the Region.
Conclusion

Volume 2 of VOP 2010 contains the area and site specific policies that address the unique or special circumstances that apply to these lands. The lands subject to Volume 2 policies are shown on Schedule 14-A, 14-B and 14-C to Volume 1 of VOP 2010. This report does not address the five focused area secondary plans that were adopted by Council on September 7, 2011 or the eight Required Secondary Plan Areas identified on Schedule 14-A, which will be reported on individually in the future. Similarly, the lands subject to the Centre Street and Dorian Place planning studies will be addressed as part of their respective processes, and are not included as part of this report.

The issues identified in this report originate with the submissions that were received by the Region of York as a result of its review and circulation process for VOP 2010 as adopted on September 7, 2010. Approximately 120 submissions were received from private citizens/landowners, development interests, interest groups, government bodies and public agencies. The Volume 1 issues were addressed by Council on September 27, 2011. At that time a number of Volume 2 issues were also addressed. In order to ensure a consolidated record of the Volume 2 modifications, those approved on September 27, 2011 have also been included in Attachment 1 to this report.

The submissions have been analyzed and where appropriate, recommendations have been made to respond to the identified issues. Each was considered on its merits taking into consideration the principles of the new plan, adherence to senior level policy direction and the unique circumstances surrounding each site. The recommended modifications are set out in Attachment No. 1.

It is noted that VOP 2010 has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board and the Region of York is no longer the approval authority. Therefore, it is recommended that Volume 2, as adopted on September 7, 2010 be modified as recommended in this report and that the report and Council minutes be forwarded to the Region of York for its consideration in the approval process. Once the Region concludes its review process of Volume 2 it is expected that the Region’s endorsed modifications will be incorporated and provide the basis for a consolidated version that will represent the public sector (City, Region, agencies, Provincial Ministries) consensus version of the Plan.

Attachments

1a. Index of Correspondence for Part B
1b. Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 2) - Summary of Respondents Requests/Staff Comments and Recommendations
2. Originating Correspondence for Volume 2 (Posted on the City’s website and available for review in the City of Vaughan Clerk’s Department)

Report prepared by:

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

Respectfully submitted,

John MacKenzie
Commissioner of Planning

Diana Birchall
Director of Policy Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Subject/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11YR</td>
<td>October 15, 2010</td>
<td>Seanna Kerr</td>
<td>Rutherford Road Market Place, at north-west corner of Bathurst and Rutherford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.032</td>
<td>R.G. Richards and Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td>September 02, 2010</td>
<td>Maria Leonis</td>
<td>Northwest quadrant of Jane St and Major Mackenzie Dr Vaughan Healthcare Campus – OPA 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>York Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21YR</td>
<td>October 04, 2010</td>
<td>Alan Young</td>
<td>10610 Jane Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.018</td>
<td>Weston Consulting Group Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53YR2</td>
<td>October 18, 2010</td>
<td>T.W. Bermingham</td>
<td>North side of Steeles Ave, east of Jane St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.038</td>
<td>Blake, Cassels and Graydon, LLP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61YR2</td>
<td>January 14, 2011</td>
<td>David A. McKay</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Regional Road 27 &amp; Milani Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.071</td>
<td>MHBC Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69YR2</td>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
<td>Alan Young</td>
<td>East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.017</td>
<td>Weston Consulting Group Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69YR2</td>
<td>June 29, 2011</td>
<td>Alan Young</td>
<td>East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.108</td>
<td>Weston Consulting Group Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70YR</td>
<td>October 06, 2010</td>
<td>Alan Young</td>
<td>10951 Highway 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.026</td>
<td>Weston Consulting Group Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83YR3</td>
<td>August 10, 2011</td>
<td>Peter Cipriano</td>
<td>Block 40/47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D06.2010.V.01.120</td>
<td>Goldpark Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Subject/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107YR D06.2010.V.01.118</td>
<td>August 06, 2011</td>
<td>Luch Ognibene The Remington Group</td>
<td>Carrville Centre Secondary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124YR D06.2010.V.01.061</td>
<td>December 02, 2010</td>
<td>Alan Young Weston Consulting Group Inc.</td>
<td>8151 Highway 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>September 22, 2010</td>
<td>Lindsay Dale-Harris Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>Northwest quadrant of the Carrville Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479YR D06.2010.V.01.077</td>
<td>February 03, 2011</td>
<td>Yurij Michael Pelech EMC Group Limited</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Steeles Ave and Islington Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479YR D06.2010.V.01.110</td>
<td>June 30, 2011</td>
<td>Yurij Michael Pelech EMC Group Limited</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Steeles Ave and Islington Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>September 01, 2010</td>
<td>Paula Bustard Smart Centres</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11YR | DATE:October 15, 2010 D06.2010.V.01.032 RESPONDENT:Seanna Kerr R.G. Richards and Associates LOCATION:Rutherford Road Market Place, at north-west corner of Bathurst and Rutherford Road. | 1. Seeks clarification that the original uses under OPA 600 would also be permitted on the site under VOP 2010. 2. Section 13.7 of Volume 2 provides for a maximum Gross Leasable Area of 26,800 sq.m. The respondent is seeking clarification that the term Gross Leasable Area only applies to commercial uses. | 1. The uses provided for in OPA 600 are covered under the “Retail” definition of VOP 2010, which means: retail, restaurant and service commercial uses. 2. Staff has confirmed that the term “Gross Leasable Area” applies only to the commercial uses on the site. | 1. No further action is required. Staff has provided correspondence advising that the uses permitted under VOP 2010 are consistent with the original permitted uses from OPA 600. 2. That Section 13.7 be modified to add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:  
*For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “Gross Leasable Area” applies only to the commercial uses on this site.* |
<p>| 15B  | DATE:September 02, 2010 RESPONDENT: Maria Leonis York Region LOCATION: Northwest quadrant of Jane St and Major Mackenzie Dr (Health Care Campus Centre) | Amendment No. 715 amends Amendment No. 508, being a site specific amendment for the expansion of the theme park, by establishing policy to develop a local urban centre focused around development of a hospital and associated healthcare campus uses. OPA 715 was approved on September of 2010. The Region of York provided comments on OPA 715 as it was incorporated into Section 13.6 of Volume 2. It is noted that Section 13.6 was written in advance of the Region’s approval, with modifications, of OPA No. 715. However, on December 13, 2011, the City adopted OPA No. 725 to further amend OPA No. 715. Upon approval of OPA 725, Section 13.6 will need to be modified to reflect the changes entailed by OPA 725. | City staff will work with the Region to ensure that its concerns are addressed in the revised version of Section 13.6 of Volume 2 once OPA 725 is approved. | That City staff work with the Region of York to modify Section 13.6 in Volume 2 of VOP 2010 to incorporate the changes resulting from the adoption of OPA 725, ensuring that the changes to Section 13.6 take into consideration all concerns of the Region of York as provided for in their correspondence of September 2, 2010, in respect of VOP 2010 and the originating OPA 715. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21YR</td>
<td>DATE: October 04, 2010 D06.2010.V.01.018</td>
<td>The subject lands are currently designated “Low Rise Residential”. The owner is requesting that the subject lands currently accommodating a Mosque and related facilities be specifically recognized in VOP 2010 with site specific policies permitting its current by-law permissions.</td>
<td>The 9.7 ha. site is a place of worship of regional scale and significance with multiple functions and it can be considered to be a “Major Institutional Use” under Section 9.2.2.11 of VOP 2010. Redesignation of this site under the “Major Institutional Designation” and providing site specific policies to recognize the development of the site with those uses provided by the current zoning by-law is supportable. Volume 1 was modified and sent to the Region in accordance with Council direction of September 27, 2011, the following is recommended: 1. That the subject lands be redesignated from “Low-Rise Residential” to “Major Institutional”. 2. That the subject site be identified on Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” as “Ahmadiyya Campus”. 3. The following policies be added as Section 13.9 of Volume 2: “Notwithstanding the policies of Section 9.2.2.11 “Major Institutional” the following uses shall be permitted on lands shown as “Ahmadiyya Campus” on Schedule 14 C and Map 13.9.A and such uses shall be associated with and be in support of the primary Place of Worship use, its activities and its community: a) Schools and other Educational Facilities including lecture halls and meeting rooms; b) Libraries; c) Cultural facilities including a community hall; d) Community Centres; e) Recreation Facilities; f) Day Care;</td>
<td>As per Council direction on September 27, 2011, the following is recommended: 1. That the subject lands be redesignated from “Low-Rise Residential” to “Major Institutional”. 2. That the subject site be identified on Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” as “Ahmadiyya Campus”. 3. The following policies be added as Section 13.9 of Volume 2: “Notwithstanding the policies of Section 9.2.2.11 “Major Institutional” the following uses shall be permitted on lands shown as “Ahmadiyya Campus” on Schedule 14 C and Map 13.9.A and such uses shall be associated with and be in support of the primary Place of Worship use, its activities and its community: a) Schools and other Educational Facilities including lecture halls and meeting rooms; b) Libraries; c) Cultural facilities including a community hall; d) Community Centres; e) Recreation Facilities; f) Day Care;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| g) Media, Broadcasting and Communications Facilities;  
  h) Non-Commercial Hospitality Facilities;  
  i) Residential Units or other Residential Accommodation for Students, Staff, Volunteers and Visitors;  
  j) Offices;  
  k) An Apartment Building;  
  l) A Nursing Home and a Retirement Home;  
  m) Portable buildings for temporary use as offices and classrooms.  
In consideration of all implementing development approvals it is the objective of the City to provide for the long-term evolution of the subject lands as a major institutional use, while ensuring compatibility with the adjacent low-rise, low density residential community, including but not limited to the consideration of building heights and massing, setbacks, landscaping and screening and building placement;” |

**53YR2**  
**DATE:**  
October 18, 2010  
D06.2010.V.01.038  
**RESPONDENT:**  
T.W. Bermingham  
Respondent is concerned that the version of OPA 620, as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, was not carried forward correctly into Volume 2 of VOP 2010. They are requesting that the approved decision on OPA 620 be Staff concurs and has been working with the respondent to revise the version of the Volume 2 policies for the Steeles West Secondary Plan to reflect the intent of the originating OPA 620 as approved by the OMB.  
That the revised version of the Steeles West Secondary Plan be incorporated into Section 11.3 of Volume 2 of VOP 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION: North of Steeles Ave &amp; east of Jane St</td>
<td>reflected in Volume 2 as the policies for the Steeles West Secondary Plan Area.</td>
<td>That in accordance with Council direction of September 27, 2011, a new Section 13.15 be added to Volume 2 of VOP 2010, which provides as follows: The following policies shall apply to the lands identified on Map 13.15.A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61YR2</td>
<td>DATE: January 14, 2011 D06.2010.V.01.071</td>
<td>RESPONDENT: David A. McKay MHBC Planning LOCATION: Northwest corner of Regional Road 27 &amp; Milani Boulevard</td>
<td>1. Request to modify current overlay of &quot;Employment Areas,&quot; which includes &quot;Commercial Mixed-Use&quot; and &quot;Infrastructure and Utilities&quot; designations, to an overlay of Primary Centres.&quot; 2. Request for site-specific policy to permit major retail use, allow exemption from 30% total gross floor area for non-retail, permit low-rise buildings, permit low-rise buildings within Infrastructure and Utilities designation.</td>
<td>13.15.1 Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.7(b) or anything else in this Plan, in addition to the existing permitted uses, Major Retail uses are permitted. 13.15.2 Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.7(c), the minimum 30% total gross floor area of non-retail uses shall not apply. 13.15.3 Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.7(e), in addition to the building types permitted, Low Rise Buildings will also be permitted. 13.15.4 Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.19(b), Low Rise Buildings may be located within the Infrastructure and Utilities designation, subject to review and approval from the appropriate utility provider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On September 27, 2011, Council directed the following: “That staff be directed to draft appropriate modifications to the 2010 Vaughan O.P. to allow existing and proposed retail commercial uses to be recognized and permitted on the lands in Ward 2 owned by 2107683 Ontario Ltd., RioCan P.S. Inc. and SRF Vaughan property Inc. for consideration in Volume 2 and without the requirement for a Comprehensive Employment Conversion Review.” Schedule 14-C has been modified to show the subject site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 69YR2 |            | 1. Concerned that Policy 10.2.1.5 indicates that the depth of the Commercial Mixed Use designation will be one lot depth, cancelling the designation on subject lands. 2. The future service node indicated in the OP at the site of a future public road and Highway 50 and cannot be signalized due to its proximity to Highway 7. Request that the service node be moved north to the property boundary between the landowner’s two parcels. | 1. In keeping with the intent of the Huntington Business Park Block Plan, staff can support a site specific exception in Policy 12.13 of Volume 2 to allow for an alternative interpretation which would confirm that the Commercial Mixed-Use designation would have a depth of approximately 200 metres, notwithstanding an intervening lot. 2. Staff concurs with this request. The proposed location will be at a future signalized intersection, which has been approved by the Regions of Peel and York and factored into the Highway 50 reconstruction program. The current location of the service node cannot be signalized because of inadequate separation from Highway 7. | 1. That the following policy be added to Policy 12.13 Huntington Business Park of Volume 2:  
*Notwithstanding policy 10.2.1.5, in the block on the north side of Highway 7 between Highway 50 and Huntington Road, the Commercial Mixed use designation will be interpreted as having a depth of approximately 200 metres from Highway 7, and accordingly will have a depth of more than one lot from Highway 7.* 2. That Volume 2 be amended to relocate the Service node on Map 12.13.A to the north, to the boundary of the subject lands. 3. That the subject site be identified on Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” as “Huntington South”. |
| 70YR  |            | The subject site is covered by OPA 570 and the implementing by-law that allows for truck-related facilities. The proponent would like to see this reflected in the new Official Plan. | On September 27, 2011, Council directed the following: “That the recommendation contained in Item 70YR to Attachment 1, Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) – Summary of Respondents’ Requests/Staff Comments and Recommendations, (Item 1, Special Committee of the Whole Report No. 39), be amended by deleting recommendation 1 and replacing it with the following: 1a. Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” of VOP 2010 | 1a. That Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” of VOP 2010 be amended to show the subject lands, recognizing that it is subject to site specific policies; and, 1b. That a new subsection be added to Section 13 of Volume 2 of the Vaughan Official Plan for the lands at 10951 Highway 50, as follows:  
*Notwithstanding the policies of Section 9.2.2.17, this Official Plan recognizes the truck stop and ancillary uses permitted by By-law 265-2002 on the lands located at* |
## Attachment 1
Part B: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 2) - Summary of Respondents Requests/Staff Comments and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83YR3</td>
<td>DATE: August 10, 2011 D06.2010.V.01.120 RESPONDENT: Peter Cipriano Goldpark Group LOCATION: Block 40/47</td>
<td>The respondent would like to affirm the position of development potential as related to the ‘peninsula’ lands in Block 40/47 and seek acknowledgement from the City that these lands may have development potential based on a series of previous meetings, discussions and site visits. The respondent is of the opinion that VOP 2010 should recognize the lands as having a “special status”, similar to policy 4.8 of the North Kleinburg-Nashville Secondary Plan recognizing lands within a ‘Special Study Area’ as being subject to further review for development potential.</td>
<td>On September 27, 2011, Council directed the following with respect to the Block 40 lands and more specifically, the “Peninsula Lands”: “That the recommendation contained in Item 83YR to Attachment 1, Part B Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (Volume 1) – Summary of Respondents Requests/Staff Comments and Recommendations, (Item 1, Special Committee of the Whole Report No. 39), be amended by deleting “no change is recommended” and substituting the following recommendation: 1a. Schedule 14-C “Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans” of VOP 2010 be amended to show the Block 40 lands currently being considered for an Official Plan Amendment; and, 1b. That, subject to consideration by Council, the following site specific Official Plan policy be added to Section 13 of Volume 2 (VOP 2010): With respect to a land feature identified as the “Peninsula Lands” within the Block 40 Lands, recognizing that it is subject to site specific policies; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be amended to show the subject lands, recognizing that it is subject to site specific policies; and 1b. That the site specific Official Plan policies recommended in the Special Committee of the Whole Report 39 of September 12, 2011, be further reviewed and amended as appropriate, for addition to Section 13 of Volume 2 (VOP 2010) for consideration by Council as part of the forthcoming report to Council on Volume 2 of the Vaughan Official Plan.” Comment 1a was completed.</td>
<td>10951 Highway 50 as identified on Map 13.11.A. The permitted uses and regulations in By-law 265-2002 shall be deemed to conform to this Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 lands currently being considered for an Official Plan Amendment; and 1b. That the following site specific Official Plan policy be added to Section 13 of Volume 2 (VOP 2010), subject to consideration by Council as part of the forthcoming report to Council on Volume 2 of the Vaughan Official Plan: With respect to a land feature identified as the “Peninsula Lands” within the Block 40 proposed Block Plan, the precise limits of the valley land, and development land, in proximity of and inclusive of the “Peninsula Lands” will be established to the satisfaction of the City and the TRCA through the Block Plan process based on studies and criteria as established by the City in conjunction with the TRCA. If it is determined by the City in conjunction with the TRCA that developable land is identified through these studies and in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the City and the TRCA, then the Low-Rise Residential designation will be incorporated as part of the Official Plan Amendment currently being considered for Block 40.&quot;</td>
<td>proposed Block Plan as shown on Map 13.10.A, the precise limits of the valley land, and development land, in proximity of and inclusive of the “Peninsula Lands” will be established to the satisfaction of the City and the TRCA through the Block Plan process based on studies and criteria as established by the City in conjunction with the TRCA. If it is determined by the City in conjunction with the TRCA that developable land is identified through these studies and in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the City and the TRCA, then the Low-Rise Residential designation will be incorporated as part of the Official Plan Amendment currently being considered for Block 40.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment 1a has been completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107YR</td>
<td>DATE: August 06, 2011 D06.2010.V.01.118 RESPONDENT: Luch Ognibene The Remington Group LOCATION: Carrville Centre</td>
<td>The respondent has raised the following with respect to the Carrville Centre: 1. Concern regarding the use of the term “Transit Facility” and the lack of a proper definition or understanding as to what is intended or required. 2. Believes the building height of 4-6 storeys and FSI of 3-3.5 for the development block situated on the south side of Marc Santi Boulevard in Block 11 may be inaccurate. 3. Remain concerned with the amount of parkland identified within the CDC, as well as the anticipated programming for the parks, given the extensive amount of parkland and greenspace within the adjoining low-rise residential communities. 4. The extent of the “Local Centre Intensification Area” for the northeast quadrant of the CDC on Schedule 1 does not properly reflect the approved boundaries. 5. It appears as though the proposed park block in the northeast quadrant of the study area has been included as</td>
<td>1. The requirement to provide for adequate transit accommodations is an important component of the Carrville District Centre Secondary Plan. The Planning process for the Secondary Plan determined that a transit facility should be located in the northwest quadrant of the Carrville District Centre Plan, and this has been reflected in policy 11.2.5.6 of the Plan. The City recognizes the importance of undergoing a process to determine the need, type of facility, precise location and design of transit services. It is further recognized that this process will take place during the completion of the Development Concept Report and Phasing Plan, as described in Section 11.2.19 and Section 10.1.1.5 (to be renumbered to 10.1.1.7) of the Official Plan. It is therefore recommended that modifications and additional language be added to policy 11.2.5.6. 2. OPA 651 designates the approximate area (0.81ha) as Medium Density Residential with a height of 2-4 stories and a density of 2.0 FSI. In the proposed Master Plan Study which was</td>
<td>1. That Section 11.2.5.6 of Volume 2 be modified to read as follows: <strong>11.2.5.6 The Carrville Centre may also include a public transit facility in the northwest quadrant of the Centre, west of Dufferin Street and north of Rutherford Road to coincide with the highest local concentration of potential ridership. It shall be designed and located to provide optimal access for pedestrians and transit vehicles. The City will work with York Region Transit and the affected landowners to identify and implement the Transit Facility within the District Centre based on policies 11.2.18.4 through 11.2.18.9. The determination of need, the type of facility, its location and design will be determined through the preparation of the Development Concept Report as required by</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part of the Natural Areas on Schedule 1.</td>
<td>presented to and approved by the Committee of the Whole working session on June 21, 2010, the site has been designated as High Density Residential with a permitted height of 4-6 stories. Generally speaking, the plan allocates a maximum density of 3.5 FSI to High Density Residential lots. However, page 18 of the Master Plan Study proposes a density of 2.52 for the subject property (“Block No. 16”). This number is more reflective of the intended uses of the site and the size of the reconfigured parcel (0.88ha). 3. The approximate size of all parks within the Carrville Centre is reflected on page 18 of the Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan (June 2010) along with the approximate sizes of all blocks within the Carrville District Centre Plan. It is important to note that specific dimensions and areas of parks are established at the time of Draft Plan of Subdivision/ Site Plan Development applications. It also been requested that policy 11.2.10.4.e be clarified. It provides that “All parkland shall be designed and built to the satisfaction of the City”. This may be interpreted as being direction for the developer to design and build the park. On this basis, it is recommended that this sentence be deleted from 11.2.10.4. 4. Schedule 1 is a conceptual schedule that identifies the approximate areas of</td>
<td>Section 11.2.19. 2. That the minimum density for parcel of land identified as “Block 16” in the Carrville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study be amended from an FSI of 3 to an FSI of 2.5. 3. No change is recommended to the parkland dedication requirement or sizes of the parks. It is recommended that the first sentence of policy 11.2.10.4.e be deleted. 4. No change is recommended at this time. This issue will be addressed in a future report on Volume 1. 5. No change is recommended at this time. This issue will be addressed in a future report on Volume 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 124YR

**DATE:** December 02, 2010  
D06.2010.V.01.061  
**RESPONDENT:** Alan Young  
**LOCATION:** 8151 Highway 50

The subject property is designated Prestige Employment and General Employment on the east side in Schedule 13-P. The range of commercial uses in Prestige Employment is reduced from previous permissions. The proponent currently has a rezoning for commercial uses that conflict with the new "Prestige Employment" designation.

On September 27, 2011, Council directed the following:  
"That the report on the site-specific policy in relation to the property located at 8151 Highway 50, in Ward 2, Item 124YR, be received and the site specific policy for this property be approved to recognize the commercial, retail warehouse and other uses permitted by By-law 171-2010 and that such policy be addressed in the

That a new subsection be added to Section 13 of Volume 2 of the Vaughan Official Plan for the lands at 8151 Highway 50, as follows:  
"Notwithstanding the policies of Section 9.2.2.10, this Official Plan recognizes the commercial, retail warehouse and other uses permitted by By-law 171-2010 on the lands located at 8151 Highway 50. The permitted uses and regulations in By-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>DATE: September 22, 2010</td>
<td>1. The proponent is requesting that the Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule (map 11.2.A on pg. 11-50 of VOP-2010, Vol. 2), be modified to:</td>
<td>Volume 2 report. “law 171-2010 shall be deemed to conform to this Official Plan.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONDENT: Lindsay Dale-Harris Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>a) reflect the valleylands identified by the established-top-of-bank map;</td>
<td>1a &amp; b. The boundary lines provided between designations within the Carrville Centre Secondary Plan are approximate. However, a top-of-bank line was established for the subject lands with the city and the TRCA in 2004. The mapping in the VOP, Volume 2 appears significantly different from this established mapping and should therefore be corrected to better reflect the agreed upon boundary line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATION: Northwest quadrant of the Carrville Centre</td>
<td>b) re-locate the stormwater pond on the tableland;</td>
<td>1c. Section 11.2.9.3 permits the following uses in the Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation: townhouses, stacked towns, and public and private institutional uses. The designation should be changed to Low Rise Residential to reflect the permitted uses; and, the minimum height should be 2 storeys to permit typical townhouse development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) reflect lower minimums for the density/height in the Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation to permit small lot single detached units;</td>
<td>2a. Section 11.2.9 of the VOP 2010, Volume 2, should be revised to read “Low Rise Residential in place of “Low-Rise Mixed-Use”. The minimum height should read 2 storeys and the maximum 3 storeys as stated in 1c above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Proponent is requesting that the VOP 2010, Volume 2 policies respecting the Carrville District Centre Plan be revised to:</td>
<td>2b. The text of section 11.2.9 should be modified to reflect changes indicated in 1c above. The maximum height was set at 3 storeys through the Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) permit building heights within the Low-Rise Mixed Use designation in the range of 2-4 storeys;</td>
<td>2b. The High-Rise Residential designation for Block 30 (lands immediately west of the proposed park), should be changed to Mid-Rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) permit building heights within the High Rise Residential west of the park in the range of 3-6 storeys;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) permit building heights within the High Rise Residential north of the east/west local road in the range of 2-16 storeys;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) include approximate size of proposed park;</td>
<td>2c. No change is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) include policies clarifying that the</td>
<td>2d. No change is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parkland dedication will be in accordance with the Planning Act; f) include policies respecting cost sharing of required facilities; and, g) to eliminate references to Transit Facility (section 11.2.5.6 of Volume 2, VOP 2010).</td>
<td>Residential and the Maximum FSI should be 2.0. The height range should also be reflected as 3-6 storeys. There appears to have been a translation error in transporting the information from the Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan (June 2010), to the VOP 2010, Volume 2. A section should be added to include this designation following section 11.2.6.8, and the permitted uses should be listed as: i. Stacked townhouses ii. Low-Rise buildings iii. Mid-Rise buildings iv. Public and Private Institutional uses v. Community facilities 2c. The Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study determined that heights on the subject lands should be within the range of 3-16 storeys to correspond to the permitted housing forms. 2d &amp; e. The approximate size of all parks within the Carrville Centre is reflected on page 18 of the Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan (June 2010) along with the approximate sizes of all blocks within the Carrville District Centre Plan. It is important to note that specific dimensions and areas of parks are established at the time of Draft Plan of Subdivision/ Site Plan Development applications. 2f. A reference to section 10.1.1.16 of the VOP 2010 Volume 1, should be added to section 11.2.19.1 of the Official Plan, Volume 2, to reflect that in some cases, a comprehensive landowner agreement may be required. 2g. Refer to Recommendation 1 under Item 107YR.</td>
<td>2e. No change is recommended. 2f. A reference to section 10.1.1.16 of the VOP 2010 Volume 1, should be added to section 11.2.19.1 of the Official Plan, Volume 2, to reflect that in some cases, a comprehensive landowner agreement may be required. 2g. Refer to Recommendation 1 under Item 107YR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volume 1 can be added to section 11.2.19.1 of Volume 2, to reflect that where necessary the requirement of a comprehensive landowner agreement may be required. 2g. The requirement to provide for adequate transit accommodations is an important component of the Carrville District Centre Secondary Plan. The Planning process for the Secondary Plan determined that a transit facility should be located in the northwest quadrant of the Carrville District Centre Plan, and this has been reflected in policy 11.2.5.6 of the Plan. The City recognizes the importance of undergoing a process to determine the need, type of facility, precise location and design of transit services. It is further recognized that this process will take place during the completion of the Development Concept Report and Phasing Plan, as described in Section 11.2.19 and Section 10.1.1.5 (to be renumbered to 10.1.1.7) of the Official Plan. It is therefore recommended that modifications and additional language be added to policy 11.2.5.6.</td>
<td>Add “*2” notation on Map 11.2.A of Volume 2 in the appropriate location, as referenced in Section 11.2.6.8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I-449**  
**RESPONDENT:** Internal  
**LOCATION:** Carrville Centre Secondary Plan  
Map 11.2.A of Volume 2 as it pertains to the Carrville Centre Secondary Plan is missing a notation, specifically “*2”, which is referenced in the text.  
“*2” referenced in policy 11.2.6.8. is not reflected on the corresponding Map 11.2.A of Volume 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>479YR</td>
<td>DATE: February 03, 2011 D06.2010.V.01.077 June 30, 2011 D06.2010.V.01.110</td>
<td>On Schedule 13-Q: the subject property is designated as &quot;General Employment&quot; and the surrounding lands to both the north and south are designated as &quot;Mid-Rise Mixed-Use&quot;. Requesting to confirm if the intent of the new Official Plan was to retain a small industrial employment designation surrounded by the new mid-rise mixed-use residential designation and if the designation was an oversight and an error of omission. Requesting the &quot;General Employment&quot; designation be replaced with the more appropriate &quot;Mid-Rise Mixed-Use&quot; designation as part of a City and/or Region of York initiated &quot;modification&quot; to the Plan document as same is reviewed and considered for approval by the Region.</td>
<td>The subject lands were removed from the Parkway Belt West Plan and designated Prestige Area by OPA 480. Request to change land use designation to a non-employment use will require an employment land conversion justification. On September 27, 2011, as a result of an Employment Land Conversion review, Council directed the following with respect to the lands located at the northwest corner of Islington Avenue and Steeles Avenue: &quot;That the subject lands be redesignated from &quot;Prestige Employment&quot; to &quot;Mid-Rise Mixed-Use&quot; with a maximum height of 8 stories and a maximum density of 2.5 FSI; and, that a policy be added to Volume 2 of VOP 2010 that require a services review of the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Steeles Avenue and Islington Avenue, to address such matters as the availability of Parkland and other services as may be determined, prior to the development of the first site for residential purposes in this quadrant, and be considered in the review of all development applications in this area.</td>
<td>1. In accordance with Council direction of September 27, 2011, it is recommended that a new Section 13.13 be added to Volume 2 of VOP 2010 as follows: 13.13.1 The lands identified on Schedule 14-C as Steeles/Islington Avenue Services Review Area, and Map 13.13.A require a services review of the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Steeles Avenue and Islington Avenue, to address such matters as the availability of parkland and other services as may be determined, prior to the development of the first site for residential purposes in this quadrant, and be considered in the review of all development applications in this area. 2. That the subject site be identified on Schedule 14-C &quot;Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans&quot; as &quot;Northwest Corner of Islington Avenue and Steeles Avenue&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION:** Northwest corner of Steeles Ave and Islington Ave
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I-500 | RESPONDENT: Internal  
| I-501 | RESPONDENT: Internal  
LOCATION: Vaughan | In Section 5.1 Kipling Avenue Corridor of Volume 2, Section 11.5.11.1 is missing land use designations and does not reflect what is listed on Map 11.5.A | Section 11.5.11.1 is missing “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” as a land use designation. Further, item ii. Site Specific Policies – The Floodplain” is not shown on Map 11.5.A | That policy 11.5.11.1 be amended to include “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” as a land use designation; and, That Map 11.5.A “Kipling Avenue – Land Use” be amended to identify the floodplain |
| I-502 | RESPONDENT: Internal  
LOCATION: Vaughan | In Section 5.1 Kipling Avenue Corridor of Volume 2, paragraph 11.5.12.9 should read "Notwithstanding 11.5.12.8 above…" instead of “…11.7.12.8…” | Paragraph 11.5.12.9 of Volume 2 currently reads: "Notwithstanding 11.7.12.8 above …" | That the reference to “11.7.12.8” be deleted from paragraph 11.5.12.9 in Volume 2 of VOP 2010 and replaced with “11.5.12.8”. |
| I-503 | RESPONDENT: Internal  
LOCATION: 7242 Highway 27 and lands situated across from it (and Toronto RV Road) | There are currently two maps labelled “Map 13.3.A” in Section 13.3 of Volume 2. The second map is unclear and does not easily reflect the heights of the buildings as per the text of Section 13.3 and the site specific OPA. | The second map in Section 13.3 should be labelled as Map 13.3.B and be modified to show the maximum heights of the buildings as per the text of the site specific OPA. | That the second map in Section 13.3 be relabelled to Map 13.3.B, and that the map be rotated to better display the maximum permitted heights of the site. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 509  | DATE: September 01, 2010  
RESPONDENT: Paula Bustard  
Smart Centres  
LOCATION: Northeast corner of Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive (Vellore District Centre) | 1. Volume 2 site specific policies for Weston and Major Mackenzie site are not correct. There were changes made by the Region which were not included in the new plan as shown in the staff report. A couple of these changes were errors that were made in the maximum GFA. These errors were acknowledged by Vaughan and the Region made the required changes.  
2. The mapping is incorrect as the Village District and Commercial District are switched.  
3. The map shows a gateway feature on our northeast boundary of the site. This is behind buildings and the intent was always to make a gateway feature midblock along Weston Road as this is the primary signalized access.  
4. There are various new policies that have been added which were not included in the original OPA 713.  
5. Other policies which extend beyond what was approved for OPA 713 are: 12.7.4.7 (as previously discussed); 12.7.5.7; 12.7.6.2; and, 12.7.6.11 (the bylaw specifies which entrances will be primary on the promenade) | There will be the need to update Section 12.7 of Volume 2 to ensure that a series of policies, approved over the last two years, have been appropriately incorporated into this section of VOP 2010. This includes OPA 713, which was approved by the Region with modifications on May 14, 2010. A further amendment, OPA 720, was approved by the Region on August 12, 2011. The latter applies to the subject lands. As such, an update of Section 12.7 of Volume 2 is warranted. | That staff review the text and mapping contained in Section 12.7 “Northeast Quadrant of Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive” in the context of the approved Official Plan Amendments 713 and 720, and make any necessary changes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-545</td>
<td>DATE: January 27, 2011</td>
<td>Items 3 and 4 on Schedule 14-C are labelled incorrectly and should be switched. I.e., Site specific area 3 should be labelled &quot;7242 Highway 27 - 13.4&quot; and site specific area 4 should be labelled &quot;Thornhill Liberty Lands - 13.5&quot;</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
<td>That Schedule 14-C be amended by switching the labels of Site Specific Areas 3 and 4, so that Area 3 is labelled &quot;7242 Highway 7 - 13.4&quot; and Area 4 is labelled &quot;Thornhill Liberty Lands - 13.5&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I-547 | DATE: January 31, 2012 | The subject lands, municipally known as 1600 Teston Road, are located to the west of Dufferin Street, on the north side of Teston Road. OPA 332 designates the subject lands as Open Space. VOP 2010 shows the lands as Core Features (western portion of the lands) and Enhancement Areas (the eastern portion of the lands) on Schedule 2, and designates the western portion as Natural Areas and eastern lands as Low Rise Residential on Schedule 13 and Map 12.3.A. The designation of the eastern portion of the lands in VOP 2010 as Low Rise Residential appears to be inconsistent with the Open Space designation in OPA 332. In order to reconcile the inconsistency, the lands should be designated as "Natural Areas" in Schedule 13 and Schedule 13-J. | On January 31, Council directed that: The Vaughan Official Plan (VOP) 2010, Volumes 1 and 2, be modified by designating the lands located at 1600 Teston Road as “Natural Areas” in Schedule 13 and Schedule 13-J in Volume 1, and identifying the lands on Schedule 14-C ‘Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans’ and adding a new subsection with specific policies regarding a portion of the lands in Section 13 ‘Site Specific Policies’ in Volume 2. | As per Council direction on January 31, 2012, it is recommended that the Vaughan Official Plan 2010, Volumes 1 and 2, be modified by: 1. Designating the lands located at 1600 Teston Road as “Natural Areas” on Schedule 13 and 13-J in Volume 1; and, 2. Identifying the lands on Schedule 14-C ‘Areas Subject to Site Specific Plans’, and modifying Section 13 ‘Site Specific Policies’ by: a. Adding a new subparagraph to Section 13.1.1 as follows: The lands known as 1600 Teston Road are identified on Schedule 14-C and are subject to policies set out in Section 13.X of this Plan. b. Adding a new subsection to Section 13 as follows: 13.X 1600 Teston Road 13.X.1.1 Notwithstanding policy 9.2.1.1 of the Official Plan, for lands designated Natural Areas at 1600 Teston Road and shown on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map 13.X.A as Area ‘B’, and which are under private ownership, it shall not be construed that these lands will necessarily remain designated as such indefinitely or that such areas are free and open to the general public. Where such lands are not acquired by a public body, application for their designation for other uses will be given due consideration by the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.X.1.2 Core Features policies in s. 3.2.3 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan apply to lands in Area ‘A’ in Map 13.X.1. Enhancement Areas policies in s. 3.2.3 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan apply to lands in Area ‘B’ in Map 13.X.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 2
(Posted on the City’s website and available for review in the City of Vaughan Clerk’s Department)

VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN 2010

ORIGNATING CORRESPONDENCE

FOR

VOLUME 2
October 15, 2010

York Region Planning Department
17250 Yonge Street, 4th Floor
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 6Z1
ATTN: Augustine Ko

RE: Vaughan Official Plan and Rutherford Market Place

Dear Mr. Ko,

We represent FCHT Holdings (Ontario) Corporation the owner and developer of the Rutherford Market Place, located at the north-west corner of Bathurst and Rutherford Rd. The site was designated Medium Density Residential/Commercial Area by OPA #600 with a Neighbourhood Commercial Centre overlay in Section 4.2.2.4. The Neighbourhood Commercial Centre designation explicitly permitted the following uses:

- A food store
- A drug store
- Other retail stores
- Pharmacies
- Banks and Financial Institutions
- Business and professional offices
- Personal Services
- Restaurants
- Service Stations
- And gas bar
- But shall not include a department store

The designation for the site in the recently passed Vaughan Official Plan is Community Area on Schedule 1, Urban Structure Map, and Mid-rise Mixed Use on Schedule 13, Land Use Map. Retail uses are permitted in this designation. Retail is defined in the newly passed Official Plan as:

"Retail shall mean retail, restaurant and service commercial uses."

We have been assured in telephone conversations with staff at the City of Vaughan that the definition of retail in the City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 is to be interpreted to include the retail uses explicitly noted above in the Neighbourhood overlay in OPA #600. We would like confirmation of this interpretation in writing.

We suggest the Region modify the definition of retail in the City of Vaughan Official Plan to read as follows:

"Retail shall mean retail, restaurant and service commercial uses including but not limited to, a food store; a drug store, pharmacies, banks and financial institutions, and personal services."

In addition to discussing this matter with staff at the City of Vaughan, we also have made submissions noting our concerns in this matter.

We look forward to discussing this matter with you further.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Seanna Kerr, Associate, M.Sc.PA

Cc: Jodi Shipe, First Capital Realty
Jeffrey Abrams, City of Vaughan, City Clerk
Melissa Rossi, City of Vaughan Planning
Mauro Peverini, Acting Manager, Policy Planning
September 2, 2010

Ms. Sybil Fernandes
Deputy City Clerk
City of Vaughan
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive
Vaughan, On L6A 1T1

Dear Ms. Fernandes:

Re: Amendment No. 715 to the Official Plan for the City of Vaughan Planning Area Healthcare Campus Centre

Attached is the Region’s Notice of Decision with respect to the above captioned Official Plan Amendment.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Maria Leonis, MCIP, RPP
Planner

Encl.

cc. John Zippay, Commissioner of Planning & Development, City of Vaughan
Quinto Annibale, Vaughan Health Care Campus (qannibale@loonix.com)
Regional Council
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (michael.fox@ontario.ca)
Ministry of Transportation (Margaret.mikolajczak@ontario.ca)
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (khuang@trca.on.ca)
Regional Planning and Development Services Department (vi.bui@york.ca)
Regional Transportation Department (dan.terzievski@york.ca)
NOTICE OF DECISION

The Regional Municipality of York is assigned as the approval authority for this Official Plan Amendment. This notice of decision is given in accordance with Section 17(35) of the Planning Act (amended 2007) on behalf of Regional Council under authority of By-law No. A-175-95-43. The decision of the Regional Municipality of York is to MODIFY and APPROVE Amendment No. 715 to the Official Plan for the City of Vaughan.

Purpose and effect of this Amendment:
Amendment No. 715 to the City of Vaughan Official Plan amends Amendment No. 508, being a site specific Amendment for the expansion of the theme park, by establishing policy to develop a local urban centre focused around the development of a hospital and associated healthcare campus uses. In addition to the hospital uses, the subject site may facilitate other uses that are related to the primary healthcare function and more intensive forms of residential and employment uses.

The subject site is located at the northwest corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Jane Street and comprises 33 hectares (82 acres) (refer to Figure 1).

Proposed Modifications to this Amendment:
Modifications to this Amendment, appended hereto as Attachment 1, include policy on travel demand management measures, road widenings and access points, enhancements to ecological features and functions, and clarifications to the Amendment.

Other applications affecting the subject lands:
N/A

For additional information:
A copy of this Official Plan Amendment as well as background information and the details of the decision will be available for inspection at the York Region Planning and Development Services Department (see address and telephone numbers at the end of this notice) from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm on regular business days. Please refer to the subject information and the File Number listed at the top of this notice. For assistance, please contact Maria Leonis, Planner, at 905-830-4444 ext. 1568 or maria.leonis@york.ca. A copy of the decision has also been supplied to the City of Vaughan Municipal Clerk and Planning Department.
When the decision will become final:
The decision of The Regional Municipality of York is final if a notice of appeal is not received before or on the last day for filing a notice of appeal.

Who may appeal:
As per Section 17(36) of the Planning Act, as amended, only the Minister, the applicant, and a person or public body who, before the plan was adopted, made oral submissions at a public meeting or written submissions to the council, may appeal the decision of the approval authority.

As per Section 8 of Ontario Regulation 543/06, only individuals, corporations, or public bodies may appeal a decision of the approval authority to the Ontario Municipal Board. A notice of appeal may not be made by an unincorporated association or group. However, a notice of appeal may be filed in the name of an individual who is a member of the association or the group on its behalf.

No person or public body shall be added as a party to the hearing of the appeal unless, before the plan was adopted, the person or public body made oral submissions at the public meeting or written submissions to the council or, in the opinion of the Ontario Municipal Board, there are reasonable grounds to add the person or public body as a party.

When and how you may appeal:
If you have objections to the decision, you may appeal all or part of the decision to the Ontario Municipal Board within 20 days after the date of this notice. Your notice of appeal, referring to the Subject information and File Number at the top of this notice, must be received in writing at the address at the end of this notice no later than 4:30 pm on the last date of appeal shown at the top of this notice. The notice of appeal must:

1) be filed with the approval authority,
2) set out the specific part of the proposed official plan or plan amendment to which the appeal applies,
3) set out the reasons for the appeal, and
4) be accompanied by the fee required by the Ontario Municipal Board (currently $125.00 payable to the Minister of Finance for Ontario; contact the York Region Planning and Development Services Department for further information) and a fee of $455.00 payable to The Regional Municipality of York for preparing the record to be submitted to the Board.
York Region Planning and
Development Services Department
York Region Administrative Centre
Box 147, 17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario, L3Y 6Z1
Telephone: (905) 830-4444
1-877-GO4-YORK (1-877-464-9675)
Facsimile: (905) 895-3482

Heather Konefat, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Director of Community Planning

Dated September 2, 2010

Figure 1
Schedule 1

City of Vaughan Official Plan Amendment No. 715

MODIFICATIONS

Part B – The Amendment of Official Plan Amendment No. 715 shall be modified as follows:

1. Replace “Toronto Region Conservation Authority” with “Toronto and Region Conservation Authority”, throughout the Amendment.

2. Modify Section 2.4 by adding d) as follows:

   “Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures will be required as part of the development to reduce the single-occupant vehicle usage and to promote other modes of transportation such as walking, cycling, and public transit to and from the urban Centre.”

3. Modify the first sentence in Section 2.5 d) so that it reads as follows:

   “Where feasible, watercourses and stormwater ponds will provide for and enhance the ecological functions and the visual amenity of the Centre.”

4. Replace Section 3.2 a) so that it reads as follows:

   “The designation of Natural Areas within the Healthcare Campus Centre will be determined through the Hospital Precinct Plan and will include the tributary corridor of the West Don River and natural or constructed wetlands related to stormwater management. Landscaped berm areas may also be designated as Natural Areas if they are intended as permanent features and support natural vegetation or contribute to an ecological function or linkage. The specific location of these uses will be determined by the City of Vaughan in consultation with Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.”

5. Add “if feasible” to Section 3.2 b) so that it reads as follows:

   “Uses within Natural Areas shall be limited to pedestrian or cycling pathways, passive recreation, and environmental management activities, if feasible.”

6. Add to the end of Section 4.0 c) the following:

   “These major connection points are subject to further study as part of the Functional Master Plan and shall require approval from York Region.”
7. Modify Section 4.0 e) so that it reads as follows:

“The Functional Master Plan shall be prepared in consultation with York Region and will establish necessary improvements to the Regional Road system including the potential expansion of Major Mackenzie Drive to six (6) through lanes of traffic during the interim phase to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. If needed, these six (6) lanes of traffic shall include four (4) general purpose lanes and two (2) High Occupancy Vehicle lanes as per York Region’s current policy.”

8. Add a new Section 4.0 f) as follows, and renumber accordingly:

“The requirement for the 45 metre right-of-way along Major Mackenzie Drive is identified on Map 12 – Street Network in the York Region Official Plan. A 45 metre right-of-way is required to support rapid transit along Major Mackenzie Drive through this area in the future. The ultimate cross-section of Major Mackenzie Drive will include four (4) general purpose traffic lanes, two (2) dedicated lanes for rapid transit, additional width for turn lanes and transit stations subject to future Environmental Assessment studies.”

9. Add to the end of Section 4.0 g) the following:

“All opportunities for pedestrian, bicycle, public transit and vehicular/emergency access to protect for and complete the transportation network will be identified and explored through the Functional Master Plan.”

10. Add a new Section 4.0 h) as follows, and renumber accordingly:

“Pedestrian and cycling connections between the Healthcare Campus Centre and the existing residential community to the north shall be encouraged and provided where appropriate to increase accessibility and connectivity.”

11. Modify Section 4.0 by adding n) as follows:

“Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures shall be identified and developed as part of this development to reduce the single-occupant vehicle usage and to promote other modes of transportation such as walking, cycling, and public transit to and from the proposed Healthcare Campus Centre and Special Study area.”

12. Modify Section 5.0 f) so that it reads as follows:

“Attention will be given to the location of the watercourse open space corridor to ensure that the ecological function of the feature is enhanced, where feasible. The type and location of the stormwater management ponds will be reviewed and approved by the City of Vaughan and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.”
13. Add to the end of Section 6.1 b) i. “and Special Study Area,”

14. Modify Section 6.3 by adding v) as follows:

"Provisions for the ultimate treatment of the tributary of the West Don River and its restoration and/or enhancement have not been determined."

15. Replace Schedule “A” – Areas of Further Study, with the attached Schedule “A”.

The purpose of these modifications is to provide clarity and ensure consistency within the proposed Official Plan Amendment. The modification does not change the intent of the Official Plan Amendment as adopted by the City of Vaughan.
Mr. Bryan Tuckey  
Commissioner of Planning  
Regional Municipality of York  
Planning Department  
17250 Yonge Street  
4th Floor  
Newmarket ON  
L3Y 6Z1  

ATTENTION: Augustine Ko  

Dear Sir:  

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan  
Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama'at Canada Inc.  
10610 Jane Street – West side of Jane St. south of Teston Road  

We are planning consultants to Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama'at Canada Inc., the owners of the lands at the above location ("the subject lands").

In 2009, the City of Vaughan enacted a zoning by-law to permit the future expansion of the mosque and a campus of institutional and residential buildings located east and west of the mosque. The first building, a community centre, is now under construction, but the entire campus will not be completed for many years.

The new Official Plan of the City of Vaughan designates the subject property as “Community Area” (Schedule 1) and “Low-Rise Residential” (Schedule 13-I). There are no site-specific provisions. As was explained to the City in the attached letter dated May 27, 2010 (attached), the new Official Plan designations do not recognize the zoning approvals granted in 2009.

The new Official Plan would not interfere with the ability of our clients to secure site plan approvals and building permits in accordance with the existing zoning, as long as that zoning remains intact. The new Official Plan is problematic, however, in three ways:

1. The City has stated that it intends to bring the Zoning By-law into conformity with the Official Plan by way of a program that will commence in 2012. Our clients would accordingly be vulnerable to future City-initiated zoning amendments that would eliminate permitted uses and reduce permitted building heights. Such an outcome would seriously undermine our clients' vision for these lands, and would
negate our clients’ efforts in preparing the master plan and supporting studies for the City’s review, all at significant expense.

2. Even if there are no City-initiated zoning changes, the lack of conformity of the existing zoning with the Official Plan will present difficulties for our clients. If in the future it is determined that a variance from the existing zoning provisions is required and desirable, the Committee of Adjustment may not have jurisdiction to deal with it there are issues related to Official Plan conformity. As a result, the more elaborate procedures associated with official plan and zoning amendments could be required to deal with minor matters.

3. Finally, as a matter of principle, it is disconcerting for our clients that the City’s new Official Plan, as a forward-looking policy document, does not recognize the role of the proposed mosque campus in the Vaughan community.

We are aware of Official Plan Policy 9.2.1.9 which maintains existing policies relating to places of worship, pending further review. This policy does not, however, defer the policies of the Official Plan related to the mosque campus, and therefore does not alleviate any of the above concerns.

We would request consideration of a modification to the new Official Plan to recognize the mosque campus by way of a site-specific policy. We would be pleased to discuss this with you further.

We request to be provided with a notice of York Region’s decision with respect to the City of Vaughan Official Plan.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

Alan Young BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Dr. Aslam Daud
Muhammad Khan
John Zipay, City of Vaughan
Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
Grant Uyeyama, City of Vaughan
Weston Consulting Group Inc.

'Land Use Planning Through Experience and Innovation'

May 27, 2010
File No. 3678

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

Dear Sir:

Re: City of Vaughan draft Official Plan - April 19, 2010
File #OP.25.1
AND
Related to Places of Worship – June 1, 2010
File# Z.10.015 (Related File 15.34.1)

Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama’at Canada Inc.
10610 Jane Street - West Side of Jane Street south of Teston Road

Weston Consulting Group Inc. (WCGI) is the planning consultant for the Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama’at Canada Inc., the owner of the subject lands located at 10610 Jane Street, on the west side of Jane Street, south of Teston Road, in the community of Maple (herein referred to as the 'subject lands').

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential” by OPA 600 and zoned A Agricultural Zone by By-law 1-88. The subject lands were subject to a Site Specific Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Z.05.010) to permit a Mosque Campus, consisting of an underground expansion to the existing Mosque, a Technology and Communications Centre, Security building, Guest Residence, townhouse dwellings, Hospitality Hall, Community Hall and Offices, Library, and 4-storey Staff and Seniors Apartment Residence. Council approved the application, and enacted the implementing zoning by-law on June 30, 2009. Please refer to the attached Zoning By-law 181-2009 schedules for the location of the subject lands and the approved development concept.

WCGI has been monitoring the City’s preparation of the new Official Plan and proposal to amend Zoning By-law 1-88 standards respecting places of worship as it relates to the subject lands. WCGI has also reviewed the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) April 12, 2010 staff Report.

On behalf of our client, WCGI offers the following comments on the Official Plan policies and zoning provisions as it relates to the subject lands.
1. **Proposed Land Use Designation**

Under the draft Official Plan (April 19, 2010), the subject lands are designated "Low Rise Residential". Places of Worship are permitted in "Low Rise Residential" areas provided they are located on a public street with a minimum right-of-way of 26 metres. Since the minimum right-of-way for Jane Street is 36 metres, the existing mosque would be permitted by this designation.

It is not clear, however, that the other components of the mosque campus would be allowed. "Public and private institutional buildings are allowed" but these are defined as "public" uses, which would exclude the institutional and recreational uses that will make up the mosque campus. Also, the approved 4-storey apartment building would not be allowed because its building type and height. A maximum of 3 storeys is proposed to apply in this designation.

We request that the full range of uses and building heights as allowed in the in-force zoning amendment (By-law 181-2009) be fully recognized in the new Official Plan. A site-specific policy will probably be required.

2. **Zoning By-law Proposals**

It is proposed that "Places of Worship" be eliminated as permitted uses in an A Agricultural Zone. The April 12, 2010 staff report states: "The proposed removal of "Places of Worship" as permitted uses in an A Agricultural Zone would result in legally existing places of worship becoming legally non-conforming, and, like other legally non-conforming properties, not able to receive a building permit for any expansion or improvements without first obtaining Committee of Adjustment approvals."

On behalf of our client, we strongly object to this outcome. The mosque should continue to enjoy full conforming status under the zoning by-law. Also, the site-specific zoning provisions should be carried forward to ensure that the entire mosque campus can be constructed incrementally without requiring further rezonings or minor variances.

In addition, we suggest that the City consider an update to By-law 1-88's general provisions related to "Height Exceptions" (Section 3.5) which exempts "Church spires" and "clock towers" but not domes and minarets from the general height limits. While the site specific Zoning By-law 181-2009 for the subject lands does exempt domes and minarets, a general amendment would be appropriate to recognize the diversity of faiths and related architectural styles that has emerged in the City.

We also suggest that the City consider an Institutional Zone which would be applied to this property and other like properties, accompanied by the site-specific regulations. The existing Agricultural zoning of this site is clearly obsolete.

We request that the above comments be addressed in the official plan and zoning review.
Should you have any questions or require clarification on this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

[Signature]

Alan Young BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

Cc: Karim Tahir, Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama'at Canada Inc
Dr. Aslam Daud, Ahmadiyya Muslim Jama'at Canada Inc
John Zipay, City of Vaughan
Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
Arto Tikiryan, City of Vaughan
Pino DiMascio, Urban Strategies
Emily Reisman, Urban Strategies
THE CITY OF VAUGHAN

BY-LAW

BY-LAW NUMBER 181-2009

A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88.

WHEREAS the matters herein set out are in conformity with the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area, which is approved and is in force at this time;

AND WHEREAS there has been no amendment to the Vaughan Official Plan adopted by Council but not approved at this time, with which the matters herein set out are not in conformity;

NOW THEREFORE The Council of The Corporation of the City of Vaughan ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. That City of Vaughan By-law Number 1-88, as amended, be and it is hereby further amended by:

a) Razing the lands shown as "Subject Lands" on Schedule "1" attached hereto from A Agricultural Zone and O52 Open Space Park Zone to A Agricultural Zone and A(H) Agricultural Zone, with the addition of the Holding Symbol "(H)" in the manner shown on the said Schedule "1."

b) Adding the following Paragraph to Section 6.0 "EXCEPTIONS":

"(1320) A. The following provisions shall apply to all lands zoned with the Holding Symbol "(H)" as shown on Schedule "E-1454", until the Holding Symbol "(H)" is removed pursuant to Subsection 38(3) or (4) of the Planning Act:

i) Lands zoned with the Holding Symbol "(H)" shall be used only for:

a) a use legally existing as of the date of the enactment of By-law 181-2009, or the production of field crops; and/or,

b) up to a maximum of seven (7) portables for the temporary use of offices accessory to a place of worship and teaching classrooms only in accordance with an approved Site Development Application pending the construction of the new Buildings.

ii) The Holding Symbol "(H)" shall not be removed from the Subject Lands or phase/portion thereof until the following conditions are satisfied:

a) water supply and sewage servicing capacity has been identified and allocated by Council;

b) approval of a Site Development Application, including but not limited to, stormwater management concerns of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority; and,

c) written clearance from the Trustee for the Block 33 East
Landowners Group confirming that the Owner of the Subject Lands has entered into and signed the Block 33 East Cost Sharing Agreement.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of:
   a) Subsections 8.0 and 8.1 respecting Uses Permitted in the A Agricultural Zone;
   b) Subsection 3.5 respecting the Height Exceptions in the A Agricultural Zone;
   c) Paragraphs 3.8 a), b) and c) respecting Parking Requirements in the A Agricultural Zone;
   d) Paragraph 3.9 d) respecting the Loading Space Requirements in the A Agricultural Zone;
   e) Subsection 3.13 respecting the Minimum Landscaped Area Percentage for a Lot and Minimum Landscaped Area where an Institutional Use abuts the boundary of lands zoned Open Space or Residential in the A Agricultural Zone;
   f) Subsection 8.1 and Schedule "A" respecting the Minimum Lot Area, Minimum Yard and Maximum Building Height Requirements in the A Agricultural Zone;

the following provisions shall apply to the lands shown as "Subject Lands" on Schedule "E-1454":

a) the following Uses shall be Permitted:
   a) **Building "A"**: A Building used as a "Technology and Education Centre" for the purposes of technology, communications and educational activities, that includes communications production for television broadcasting and programming, and a lecture/meeting hall, where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 4,515 m², with a maximum lecture/meeting hall seating capacity of 100 people;
   b) **Building "B"**: A Building (loft) used as a "Security Building", where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 26 m²;
   c) **Building "C"**: A Building used as a "Guest Residence", where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 2,505 m²;
   d) **Buildings "D", "E", "F" and "G"**: Townhouse Dwellings containing up to a Maximum of 6 Units per Building;
Building "H": A Building used as a "Hospitality Hall" for the purpose of entertaining a large assembly of people, that includes a community dining hall, kitchen and food preparation area, and an accessory office, where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 2,350 m², with a maximum dining hall seating capacity of 500 people;

For the purposes of this paragraph, a "Hospitality Hall" shall mean: a Building that is used to prepare and/or provide food and drink for consumption within or outside the Building for functions associated with the place of worship, on the same Lot, and shall not be for commercial purposes.

Building "J": A Building used as a "Community Hall and Offices" for the purposes of social and recreational functions, and office use, that includes multi-purpose halls/auditoriums, where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 11,210 m², with a maximum community hall seating capacity of 1,500 people for the "Community Hall", and a maximum full-time office workers capacity of 50 people for the "Offices";

For the purposes of this paragraph a "Community Hall and Offices" shall mean a Building with multi-purpose halls/auditoriums that is used for functions associated with the place of worship, on the same Lot, and shall not be used for commercial purposes.

Building "K": A Building used as a "Library", where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 2,315 m², including a Basement Gross Floor Area of 770.19 m²;

Building "L": A Building used as a "Place of Worship", where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 2,830 m², including a Basement Gross Floor Area of 1,753 m²;

Building "M": A Building used as an "Office", where the Maximum Gross Floor Area for the Building shall not exceed 510 m²;

Building "N": A "Residential Apartment Building" containing
up to a Maximum of 80 Units;

k) up to a maximum of seven (7) portables for the temporary use of offices accessory to a place of worship and teaching classrooms only in accordance with an approved Site Development Application pending the construction of the new Buildings;

b) the Height restrictions shall not apply to:
   a) crenelation towers;
   b) domes;
   c) ornamental towers;
   d) mirabets;

d) the Minimum Number of Parking Spaces shall be:
   a) Building "A": 2 spaces per 100 m² of Gross Floor Area (GFA);
   b) Building "B": 3 spaces, provided the Building does not exceed 30 m² of GFA;
   c) Building "C": 4 spaces, provided the Building does not exceed 2,500 m² of GFA;
   d) Buildings "D", "E", "F" & "G": 2 spaces per Unit;
   e) Building "H": 1 space per every 3 persons in the maximum designated capacity/occupancy of the Building;
   f) Buildings "J" & "L": 2 spaces per 100 m² of GFA, provided a minimum of 222 spaces are provided;
   g) Building "K": 2 spaces per 100 m² of GFA;
   h) Building "M": 2 spaces per 100 m² of GFA;
   i) Building "N": 1.5 spaces per Unit;

d) Loading and Unloading place anywhere on the Lot except between a Building and Highway #400, and a Building and Jane Street;

a) a Minimum of 35% of the Lot shall be Landscaped;

a(i) the Minimum Landscaped Strip shall be 1.5 m and 2.0 m abutting the north property line and 1.5 m abutting the south property line as shown on Schedule "E-1454";

f) the Minimum Lot Area shall be 0.7 ha;

fl) the Minimum Yards shall be:
   a) Front (East): 14 m;
   b) Interior Side (South): 13 m for Buildings "F" and "G";
   c) Exterior Side (North): 8 m for Building "N";
   d) Rear (West): 14 m for the Highway 400 property limit,
above and below grade, including any alleys and parking areas;
fill) the Maximum Building Height for Building "N" shall not exceed 16 m (4 storeys).

(c) Adding Schedule "E-1454" attached hereto as Schedule "1."

d) Deleting Key Map 6E and substituting therefor the Key Map 6E attached hereto as Schedule "2."

2. Schedules "1" and "2" shall be and hereby form part of this By-law.

READ a FIRST, SECOND and THIRD time and finally passed this 30th day of June, 2009.

"Linda D. Jackson"
Linda D. Jackson, Mayor

"Jeffrey A. Abramst"
Jeffrey A. Abramst, City Clerk
KEY MAP 5E
BY-LAW NO. 1-88

THIS IS SCHEDULE '2'
TO BY-LAW \81 - 2009
PASSED THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2009

FILE No. Z.05.010
LOCATION: Part of Lot 25, Concession 5
APPLICANT: AHMADIYYA MUSLIM JAMA'AT CANADA INC.
CITY OF VAUGHAN

SIGNING OFFICERS
"Linda D. Jackson"  MAYOR
"Jeffrey A. Abram"  CLERK
SUMMARY TO BY-LAW 181-2009

The lands subject to this By-law are located on the west side of Jane Street, south of Teston Road, being Part of Lot 25, Concession 6, City of Vaughan.

The purpose of this By-law is to rezone the subject lands from A Agricultural Zone and GS2 Open Space Park Zone to A Agricultural Zone and A "H" Agricultural Zone, with addition of the Holding Symbol "H" to facilitate the development of the 0.78 ha subject lands with a campus development consisting of 13 buildings related to the existing place of worship.

The By-law zones portions of the subject lands A(H) Agricultural Zone, with the addition of the Holding Symbol "H", which cannot be removed until the following specific conditions are addressed:

1. Lands zoned with the Holding Symbol "H" shall be used only for:
   a) a use legally existing as of the date of the enactment of this By-law for the subject lands, or the production of field crops; and/or,
   b) up to a maximum of seven (7) portables for the temporary use of offices accessory to a place of worship and teaching classrooms only in accordance with an approved Site Development Application pending the construction of the new Buildings.

2. The Holding Symbol "H" shall not be removed from the Subject Lands or phase/portion thereof until the following conditions are satisfied:
   a) water supply and sewage servicing capacity has been identified and allocated by Council;
   b) approval a Site Development Application, including but not limited to, stormwater management concerns of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority; and
   c) written clearance from the Trustee for the Block 33 East Landowners Group confirming that the Owner of the Subject Lands has entered into and signed the Block 33 East Cost Sharing Agreement.

The By-law also provides site specific zoning requirements to facilitate the development of the buildings proposed to be utilized for a Technology and Education Centre (Building "A"), a Security Building (Building "B"), a Guest Residence (Building "C"), 24 Townhouse Dwelling Units (Buildings "D", "E", "F" and "G"), a Hospitality Hall (Building "H"), a Community Hall and Offices (Building "J"), a Library (Building "K"), a Place of Worship (Building "L"), an Office Building (Building "M"), an 80 Unit Apartment Building (Building "N") and up to a maximum of seven (7) portables for the temporary use of offices accessory to a place of worship and teaching classrooms only in accordance with an approved Site Development Application pending the construction of the new Buildings.

The By-law provides for site specific exceptions for the parking standards for each building, loading and unloading locations on the lot, and landscaping, minimum yard and building height requirements for the A Agricultural Zone requirements in By-law 1-68 as follows:

1. exempt cantilever towers, domes, ornamental towers and minarets from height restrictions;
2. require a minimum of 1,020 parking spaces, whereas 1,020 parking spaces are required;
3. permit loading and unloading anywhere on the lot, except between a building and Highway #400, and a building and Jane Street, whereas no loading and unloading is permitted between a building and a street;
4. require a minimum landscaped strip of 1.5 m and 2.0 m abutting the north property line and 1.5 m abutting the south property line for portions of the lot, whereas a landscaped strip of 2.4 m is required;
5. require a minimum landscaped area of 36%, whereas a landscaped area of 10% is required;
6. require a minimum lot area of 9.7 ha, whereas a minimum lot area is not required;
7. require a minimum front (east) yard of 14 m, whereas a front yard of 16 m is required;
8. require a minimum interior side (south) yard of 13 m, whereas an interior side yard of 15 m is required;
9. require a minimum exterior side (north) yard of 8 m, whereas an exterior side yard of 15 m is required;
10. require a minimum rear (west) yard of 14 m for the Highway 400 property limit, above and below grade, including any alleys and parking areas, as required by the Ministry of Transportation; and
11. permit up to a maximum building height of 15 m (4 storeys) for Building "N", whereas a maximum building height of up to 11 m is permitted.
October 18, 2010

VIA FACSIMILE AND REGULAR MAIL

Region of York
Planning Department
17250 Yonge Street, 4th Floor
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 6Z1

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: City of Vaughan, New Official Plan
Re: Request for Notice of Decision pursuant to Section 17(35) of the Planning Act

We wish to follow up on our letter of October 4, 2010 on behalf of our clients, United Parcel Service Canada Ltd. and 724352 Ontario Ltd.

At that time, we requested written notice of any decision made by the Region of York in its capacity as approval authority for the new Official Plan for the City of Vaughan, including any decision made with respect to the Yonge-Steeles Corridor Secondary Plan (City of Vaughan File YS-25.5.12.4). The letter was addressed to the City Clerk’s office and in accordance with the notice, this duplicate request is being sent to the attention of the Planning Department.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours very truly,

T. W. Bermingham
TWB/mg

Reference: 24580/799
January 14, 2011

Augustine Ko
Planning Services
Region of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, ON
L3Y6Z1

Dear Mr. Ko:

RE: ADOPTED VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN
2107683 ONTARIO LTD., RiOCAN PS INC., AND SRF VAUGHAN PROPERTY INC.
NORTHWEST OF HIGHWAY 27 AND MILANI BOULEVARD
OUR FILE: 9922 BN

We are the planning consultants for 2107683 Ontario Ltd., Riocan PS Inc., and SRF Vaughan Property Inc. Our client’s solicitor submitted letters to the City of Vaughan on April 27, 2010 on behalf of our clients regarding concerns with the new Vaughan Official Plan (see attached letter for your reference).

The subject site is currently designated General Commercial (OPA451), Employment Area General in the current City of Vaughan Official Plan. This designation permits retail warehousing, as well as limited retail uses as prescribed in site specific OPA 450. Our client obtained approvals for a zoning by-law amendment to rezone a portion of the subject lands Retail Warehouse Employment Area (EM3) Zone to facilitate a retail warehouse development. Additional Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan approval applications have also been submitted (September 2009) and our client has been working with the City since then to facilitate these approvals.

We had reviewed the draft Official Plan and all staff reports relative to the plan, and had offered several recommended modifications to recognize the existing and proposed development approvals in the new Official Plan.

We have now reviewed the Official Plan as adopted by Vaughan Council on September 7, 2010, and find that the adopted Official Plan does not satisfy the concerns raised relative to our client’s site. There are still several outstanding issues with the adopted Official Plan relative to these sites. Our concerns are discussed in detail below.
Concerns with Adopted Official Plan

The proposed Official Plan designates the subject lands “Commercial Mixed Use” and “Infrastructure and Utilities” with an “Employment Areas” overlay designation. While the Commercial Mixed Use designation permits retail uses, it restricts the uses to a mid-rise building format. The Employment Areas overlay further prohibits major retail uses (greater than 10,000 square metres).

Given the existing and proposed major retail uses on our client’s lands, City staff recognized that a site specific exception would be appropriate for the lands as noted in the City of Vaughan Committee of the Whole report dated July 28, 2010 as per Attachment 1, Part B, Item 61 to the staff report (attached for your convenience). Unfortunately, this special exception was never implemented in the final Council adopted version of the Vaughan Official Plan.

We request that the Region of York modify the proposed City of Vaughan Official Plan by implementing a site specific policy as was recommended in City’s Committee of the Whole Report. Accordingly, we recommend the following modifications be made:

1) Redesignate the subject lands from Employment Area to Primary Centres on Schedule 1 of the new City of Vaughan Official Plan.

2) Add a site specific policy:
   a. Notwithstanding policy, 9.2.2.7(b), in addition to the existing permitted uses, Major Retail uses are permitted.
   b. Notwithstanding policy, 9.2.2.7(c), there will be no required amount of gross floor area other than retail required.
   c. Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.7(e), in addition to the building types permitted, low-rise buildings will also be permitted.
   d. Notwithstanding policy 9.2.2.19(b), low rise buildings may be located within the Infrastructure and Utilities designation, subject to review/approval from the appropriate utility provider.

We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss the foregoing.

Thank you,

Yours truly,

MHBC

[Signatures]

cc. J. Farber, I. Beauvoir, M. Feyn"
June 29, 2011  
File No. 5190-2

Mr. John Mackenzie  
Commissioner of Planning  
City of Vaughan  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario  
L6A 1T1

ATTENTION: Roy McQuillan

Dear Sir: 

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan  
Woodbridge Farmers Co. Ltd., 1510904 Ontario Ltd. and 1510905 Ontario Ltd.  
East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7, Huntington Business Park

We are planning consultants to the above companies which together own two parcels ("the subject lands") with a combined area of approximately 12 ha (30 acres) in the above location.

In our letter dated September 30, 2010, addressed to the Region of York, we indicated on behalf of our clients that we had two remaining concerns with the new Official Plan provisions affecting the above lands.

On June 27, 2011, I had an opportunity to discuss these concerns in a meeting with Ms. Birchall, Mr. McQuillan and other Vaughan planning staff, and with Mr. Ko of the Region of York.

At the conclusion of that discussion, Mr. McQuillan asked that I provide the text of a site-specific policy that would resolve the concern related to the boundary of the Commercial Mixed Use designation along Highway 7. The purpose of this modification would be to ensure that the Highway 7 intensification corridor achieves its full intended width of 200 metres in this prime corner/gateway location.

The problem arises from Policy 10.2.1.5 which indicates that the depth of the Commercial Mixed Use designation is only "one lot depth". This provision would effectively cancel the Commercial Mixed Use designation on the subject lands which comprise the second and third parcels north of Highway 7. In the result, at this prime corner there would be a shallow intensification corridor, with a depth of only about 50 metres, which, in our submission, would not be good planning.
We therefore request that the following policy be added under the heading of the Huntington Business Park (Section 12.13):

"Notwithstanding policy 10.2.1.5, in the block on the north side of Highway 7 between Highway 50 and Huntington Road, the Commercial Mixed use designation will be interpreted as having a depth of approximately 200 metres from Highway 7, and accordingly will have a depth of more than one lot from Highway 7."

We would also reiterate our request regarding the Service Node. Map 12.13A shows a Service Node on our client's southerly parcel, partially overlapping the Commercial Mixed Use designation. The Highway 50 access for a commercial development at this location cannot be signalized because of inadequate distance separation from Highway 7. We request that the Service Node be moved north, to the boundary between the two parcels owned by our clients where it will be located at a future signalized intersection, which has been approved by the Regions of Peel and York and factored into the Highway 50 reconstruction program. This revised location would ensure that the Service Node is as conveniently located as possible.

We request that the above modifications be recommended for approval and forwarded to the Region of York for inclusion in its decision on the Vaughan Official Plan. We would be pleased to provide any clarification as required.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

[Signature]

Alan Young BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Dennis Hayhoe and Bernie Hayhoe
    Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
    Augustine Ko, Region of York
Hi Roy, please find attached a letter containing the draft policy language you requested to resolve the concern relating to the "one-lot-depth" provision for the Commercial Mixed Use designation on Highway 7. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Alan

Alan Young, Senior Associate, BSc MSc MCIP RPP
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Vaughan Office: tel. 905.738.8080 ext. 231 | 201 Millway Ave., Unit 19, Vaughan, ON, L4K 5K8
October 6, 2010
File No. 5182

Mr. Bryan Tuckey
Commissioner of Planning
Regional Municipality of York
Planning Department
17250 Yonge Street
4th Floor
Newmarket ON
L3Y 6Z1

ATTENTION: Augustine Ko

Dear Sir:

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan
2157160 Ontario Inc. (Sagar Aggarwal)
10901 Highway 50 – East side of Highway 50 and west side of Cold Creek Road, north of Nashville Road and south of Mayfield Road

We are planning consultants to 2157160 Ontario Inc., the owner of the 4.32 ha parcel at the above location (“the subject lands”) (see attached air photo).

In the new City of Vaughan Official Plan, the subject lands are designated “Natural Areas and Countryside” (Schedule 1) and “Agricultural” and “Natural Areas” (Schedule 13-F). The subject lands lie outside the West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan. There are no site-specific provisions affecting the subject lands, notwithstanding the 2006 Ontario Municipal Board approval of OPA 570 (attached) and the implementing zoning by-law which allow trucking-related facilities on the subject lands.

We note that another property in this same block has a site-specific policy permitting a “truck transport facility” (13.4). This location is identified in the Official Plan as 1125 Highway 50, but this address must be incorrect. The property is located on the east side of Highway 50 opposite Mayfield Road.

Our letter to the City, dated May 17, 2010 (attached), explained the need to recognize the existing approval applicable to the subject lands. Without such recognition, the owner would be vulnerable to a future City-initiated downzoning when the City moves to update its Zoning By-law in conformity with the new Official Plan.

Since 1981

Vaughan Office: 201 Millway Avenue, Unit 19, Vaughan, Ontario, L4K 5K8
Tel. 905-738-8080

Oakville Office: 1660 North Service Road East, Suite 114, Oakville, Ontario, L6H 7G3
Tel. 905-844-8749

1-800-363-3558 Fax. 905-738-6637 www.westonconsulting.com
We would request consideration of a modification to the new Official Plan to recognize the approved, but not yet developed uses, by way of a site-specific policy. Complementary uses could also be added. We would be pleased to discuss this with you further.

We also request to be provided with a notice of York Region's decision with respect to the City of Vaughan Official Plan.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

Alan Young BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Sagar Aggarwal, 2157160 Ontario Inc.
John Zipay, City of Vaughan
Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
Grant Uyeyama, City of Vaughan
May 17, 2010
File No. 5182

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

Dear Sir:

Re: City of Vaughan DRAFT Official Plan Volume 1 – April 2010
   10901 Highway #50 – East side of Highway 50 north of Nashville Road
   Part of Lot 27, Concession 11
   City of Vaughan
   File#OP.25.1

Weston Consulting Group Inc. (WCGI) is the planning consultant for Sagar Aggarwal being the owner of the property identified above.

The subject lands comprise a “through lot” with frontage on the east side of Highway No. 50 and the west side of Cold Creek Road, north of Nashville Road. The area of the property is approximately 4.33 ha (10.79 acres). The site is currently vacant. The site contains an existing watercourse in the southwest corner of the site which falls within the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (“TRCA”) regulated area.

In 2000, the previous owner of the property, 1433666 Ontario Inc., submitted Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications to permit the development of the lands for trucking-related uses. These applications were approved by the City but were appealed by the Region of Peel, the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon. The appeals were dismissed by the Ontario Municipal Board (PL020694) in its decision dated July 26, 2006 (attached).

OPA 570, as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, permits "a truck dealership and repair facility, truck parking display, restaurant with a drive-through and refueling station" on the subject property. OPA 570 included the deletion of the "Valley and Stream Corridor designation, within the area of the subject property, with the concurrence of TRCA."
The amending zoning by-law, which was also approved, permits a motor vehicle sales establishment, a convenience eating establishment, either with or without a drive-through, and a truck refuelling station.

The previous owner of the property did not proceed with the approved development. The new owner wishes to proceed with the same uses, and, in addition, an automobile service station and a hotel/motel. A banquet hall or conference centre is contemplated in conjunction with a hotel.

The draft Official Plan designates the subject lands as "Agricultural" and "Natural Areas" (Schedule 13-A), and places them within the "Future Strategic Employment Lands" (Schedule 14). The "Natural Areas" designation for the site represents the previous Valley and Stream Corridor designation.

We understand that staff do not intend to incorporate the site-specific provisions of OPA 570 into the new Official Plan. Also, the draft Official Plan, unlike the York Region Official Plan, does not contain any general policies recognizing existing uses or prior approvals.

The draft Official Plan, accordingly, would have a severe impact on the subject property. If the Official Plan does not recognize the previous approvals in some way, a future Zoning By-law update to implement the new Official Plan would have to downzone the subject property back to agricultural uses.

We would request that the previous approval be recognized in the new Official Plan by way of a site-specific policy. We also request that the range of uses be broadened to include additional complementary uses, i.e. an automobile service station, a hotel/motel, banquet hall and conference centre which would complement the other uses on the site.

We would also draw to your attention that there are other site-specific approvals and existing non-agricultural uses in this area which call into question the validity of the proposed "Agricultural" designation. There is little prospect that these lands will revert to agricultural uses.

We would request your positive consideration of our submission and would be pleased to discuss the matter further.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

[Signature]

Alan Young, BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Sagar Aggarwal, Service Station Consulting Inc.
    Diana Birchall, Director of Policy
    Pino DiMascio, Urban Strategies
    Emily Reisman, Urban Strategies
THE CITY OF VAUGHAN

BY-LAW

BY-LAW NUMBER 506-2001

A By-law to adopt Amendment Number 570 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the City of Vaughan ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. THAT the attached Amendment Number 570 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area, consisting of the attached text and Schedule(s) "1" and "2" is hereby adopted.

2. AND THAT the City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to make application to the Regional Municipality of York for approval of the aforementioned Amendment Number 570 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area.

3. AND THAT this By-law shall come into force and take effect on the day of the final passing thereof.

READ a FIRST, SECOND and THIRD time and finally passed this 18th day of December, 2001.

L. D. Jackson, Mayor

J. D. Leach, City Clerk
I PURPOSE

The purpose of this Amendment to the Official Plan is to amend OPA #600 by redesignating the lands from "Rural Use Area" and "Valley and Stream Corridor" to "Rural Use Area" and to provide a site specific exception to the "Rural Use Area" policies to permit commercial development.

II LOCATION

The lands subject to this Amendment, herein after referred to as "Subject Lands", are shown on Schedules "1" and "2" hereto as "Area Subject to Amendment No. 570". The lands are located between Highway #50 and Cold Creek Road, north of Nashville Road, being 10901 Highway #50, in Lot 27, Concession 11, City of Vaughan.

III BASIS

The decision to amend the Official Plan to redesignate the subject lands from "Rural Use Area" and "Valley and Stream Corridor" to "Rural Use Area" is based on the following:

1. An Official Plan Amendment is required to permit commercial uses in the "Rural Use Area".


IV DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT AND POLICIES RELATIVE THERETO

Amendment No.600 to the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning Area is hereby amended by:

a) Redesignating the lands shown as "Area Subject to Amendment No.570" on Schedules "1" and "2" attached hereto from "Rural Use Area" and "Valley and Stream Corridor" to "Rural Use Area".

b) Adding the following to Section 6.2.1.1 Exceptions:

b) Notwithstanding the uses permitted on lands designated "Rural Use Area", a truck dealership and repair facility, truck parking and display, restaurant with a drive-through and re-fuelling station, may be permitted on the lands shown as "Area Subject to Amendment No. 570."
THIS IS SCHEDULE '1'
TO AMENDMENT No. 570
ADOPTED THE 18 DAY OF DECEM BER, 2001

SIGNING OFFICERS

MAYOR

CLERK

LEGEND

....................................................
RURAL USE AREA

LOCATION: PART OF LOT 27, CON. 11
THE CITY OF VAUGHAN PLANNING DEPT.

AREA SUBJECT TO
AMENDMENT No. 570

COLD CREEK ROAD

HIGHWAY No. 50
APPENDIX I

The subject lands are located between Highway #50 and Cold Creek Road, north of Nashville Road, being 10901 Highway #50, in Lot 27, Concession 11, City of Vaughan. At the Council Meeting of November 26, 2001, Council considered applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and resolved:

"The Committee of the Whole recommends:

1) That Official Plan Amendment Application OP.00.014 and Zoning By-law Amendment Z.00.064 (Gilbert Michael Plummer) be approved subject to an "H" holding symbol to be in place pending approval of the Site Plan Application;

2) That the following report of the Commissioner of Planning, dated November 19, 2001, be received; and

3) That the deputation of Mr. Stephen G. Armstrong, Armstrong, Goldberg, Hunter, 9251 Yonge Street, Suite 302, Richmond Hill, L4C 9T3, on behalf of the applicant, and written submission dated November 13, 2001, be received."
APPENDIX II
EXISTING LAND USE
OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT No. 570
CITY OF VAUGHAN

LEGEND
- AREA SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT No. 570
- COMMERCIAL
- RESIDENTIAL
- AGRICULTURAL

LOCATION: PART OF LOT 27, CON. 11
THE CITY OF VAUGHAN PLANNING DEPT.

VAUGHAN RD.
ALBION RD.
HIGHWAY No. 50
COLD CREEK
KIRBY ROAD
NASHVILLE ROAD
Ontario
Hydro
August 10, 2011

John MacKenzie
Commissioner of Planning

Diana Birchall,
Director of Policy Planning

City of Vaughan
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive
 Vaughan, Ontario
L6A 1T1

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010

The purpose of this letter is to re-affirm our position of development potential as related to what is known as the "Peninsula Lands" in Blocks 40/47; to reiterate and clarify our position with respect to deficiencies in the City of Vaughan's Official Plan 2010 with respect to the Peninsula Lands and to seek acknowledgement from the city that these lands may have development potential based on our understanding as a consequence of previous discussions, correspondence and site visits with city staff, TRCA staff and council members, and based on different treatment given in the new Official Plan for a similar situation. The former Commissioner of Planning is very familiar with the background and can confirm the above.

As early as 2003, with the submission of a proposed Block Plan, the Peninsula Lands were considered to have developmental potential. The landowners have consistently maintained this position to the present and continue to do so.

Through correspondence to Diana Birchall, dated May 18, 2010, the City has been notified of the concern regarding the new Official Plan 2010 in that the Plan does not recognize the possibility of development on the Peninsula Lands. This correspondence touched on a number of issues related to Blocks 40/47 inclusive of the Peninsula Lands. Mr. Jeff Abrams was notified in a letter dated June 11, 2010 of the numerous concerns we have regarding the new OP 2010 related to Blocks 40/47. In addition, a letter has been filed with the Region, dated October 14, 2010 requesting notification of the Regions' decision on the Official Plan in order to maintain our rights for further action.
Ko, Augustine

From: Luch Og nibene [log nibene@remington group inc.com]
Sent: August 5, 2011 10:54 AM
To: clement.chong@vaughan.ca; roy mcqu illen@vaughan.ca; Ko, Augustine
Cc: diana.birchall@vaughan.ca; John MacKenzie; Rudy Bratty
Subject: Vaughan Official Plan
Importance: High
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

This email is a follow-up to a voice message I left Clement Chong earlier in the week concerning a number of follow-up items associated with the new Vaughan Official Plan and comments we had previously provided (either directly or through our consultants) regarding various parcels of land in the City. For reporting purposes I have referenced the associated Item Number as identified in the “Summary of Respondents’ Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations” which formed part of the reporting on the new Official Plan.

Block 60 East Elder Mills (Items 24B/24C/107)
There are a couple of follow-up matters concerning the Land Use Schedules and how these lands are being treated. We had raised a question as to why the previous gravel pit on the subject property was being depicted as a water body, and note that the staff comment in response was that it appears on the York Region Atlas. This same comment was made to the Region of York staff as part of the Region’s OP update, and they agreed with us that no such body of water exists and amended the Regional land use schedules accordingly. We ask that staff confirm this point with the Region and make the necessary changes to the Vaughan OP. If necessary we can facilitate a site visit to verify existing site conditions.

We further note that these lands have not been included on Schedule 14A, and believe they should be identified as requiring a Secondary Plan; if not, we would like to better understand how the planning for these lands is proposed to be carried-out.

While we are generally satisfied with the proposed re-wording associated with Enhancement Areas, we remain concerned with the extent of what has been schematically shown on Schedule 2. We would like to better understand the source for this mapping and what form of field verification may have been carried-out.

Jan-Sll Property (Item 107)
The comments we previously provided regarding this property appear to have been addressed, with the exception of the associated Land Use Schedules (Schedules 2, 13, 13T) which continue to show these lands as “Natural Areas”.

Carrville District Centre (Item 107)
We have previously voiced our concerns regarding the use of the term “Transit Facility” and the lack of any proper definition or understanding as to what is intended or required. We have met with staff from York Region Transit on a number of occasions, and based on our discussions with them we do not believe they have any present or future plans to locate a “transit facility” within the Carrville District Centre (CDC). We believe the term should be more appropriately defined and understood, as there are significant cost sharing implications which may result from such a facility.

23/08/2011
We also believe there may be a discrepancy between the proposed building heights and density range (FSI) for the development block situated on the south side of Marc Santi Boulevard in Block 11, immediately west of the Park Block – it references a building height of 4-6 storeys and an FSI of 3-3.5. We request these figures be re-confirmed.

We remain concerned with the amount of parkland identified within the CDC, as well as the anticipated programming for these parks. There is an extensive amount of parkland and greenspace (valleylands and woodlots) within the adjoining low-rise residential communities, and the parks within CDC in our opinion should be tailored to a more urban setting. We also believe the wording specific to the provision and construction of these parks is somewhat ambiguous, and should be clarified.

We also note that the extent of the “Local Centre Intensification Area” for the northeast quadrant of CDC as identified on Schedule 1 – Urban Structure does not properly reflect the approved boundaries; furthermore, it would appear the proposed park block has been included as part of the Natural Area associated with the woodlot feature in the same quadrant.

We would be pleased to meet with staff to further review and/or discuss these matters, if warranted. This email has also been sent to the Region of York so they have a formal record for their files.

Sincerely,

Lucio Gogobene, MCIP RPP
VP of Land Development
The Remington Group
7501 Keele Street, Suite 100
Vaughan, ON L4K 1Y2
T. (905) 761-8200 Ext. 234
F. (905) 761-8201
E. logimbene@remingtongroupinc.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information in this electronic mail message is private and confidential to the ordinary user of the e-mail address to which it was addressed and may also be privileged. Should you receive this message in error, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or use of this message and its attachments is strictly prohibited; and should be deleted from your system. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply transmission and promptly delete this communication without copying it or opening any attachments. Thank you.
December 2, 2010
File No. 3975

Mr. Bryan Tuckey
Commissioner of Planning
Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
4th Floor
Newmarket ON
L3Y 6Z1

ATTENTION: Augustine Ko

Dear Sir:

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan
1693143 Ontario Inc. and 1693144 Ontario Inc. ("the owners")
8151 Highway 50
East side of Highway 50, south of future Ebenezer Road extension

We are planning consultants to the above companies which own a 3.98 ha parcel at the above location (Huntington Business Park - Block 57/58).

The new Official Plan of the City of Vaughan designates the west half of the subject property as “Prestige Employment” and the east half as “General Employment” (Schedule 13-P). These designations are generally consistent with the approved Block Plan, but the range of commercial uses permitted within the Prestige Employment designation is significantly reduced in the new Official Plan.

Following approval of the Owners rezoning application, Vaughan Council, on June 29, 2010, enacted Bylaw 171-2010 (attached), rezoning the lands in conformity with OPA 450 and the Block Plan.

A site plan application has not been submitted, and accordingly development of the property has not commenced.

In the attached letter dated June 10, 2010, we requested that the new Official Plan recognize approved zoning on parcels such as the Owners’. The City did not take any action in this regard. Accordingly, if the Official Plan is approved as submitted, the Owners lands will be vulnerable to a future downzoning that would significantly reduce the range of permitted commercial uses when the City amends its Zoning By-law to achieve conformity with the new Official Plan.
The owner has incurred significant expenses in securing a rezoning in accordance with the existing Official Plan and is very concerned with regard to the City’s new Official Plan. The document in its current form is unacceptable and accordingly, we would request that consideration be given to a modification to the City of Vaughan Official Plan to address the above issue. This could take the form of a site-specific policy. We would be pleased to discuss this with you further.

We request to be provided with notices of York Region’s decision with respect to the City of Vaughan Official Plan.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

Alan Young BES MSc MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Susie Iacobucci
    John Zipay, City of Vaughan
    Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
    Grant Uyeyama, City of Vaughan
July 23, 2010

1693143 Ontario Inc. & 1693144 Ontario Inc.
1021 Meyerside Drive, Unit 10
Mississauga, Ontario
L5T 1J6

Dear Sirs:

RE: CITY OF VAUGHAN BY-LAW 171-2010

Please find attached a copy of the above-mentioned by-law, and City Clerk’s Affidavit. This by-law is in effect, as of June 29, 2010.

Sincerely,

Joan Hamill
Administrative Co-ordinator/Technician
Clerk’s Department

Attachments

Copy to: Weston Consulting Group Inc., Attn: Alan Young
THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF VAUGHAN

IN THE MATTER OF Section 34, Subsections (18) and (19) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13

I, JEFFREY A. ABRAMS, of the City of Toronto, make oath and say:

1. THAT I am the City Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Vaughan and as such, have knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to.

2. THAT By-law Number 171-2010 was passed by the Council of the Corporation of the City of Vaughan on the 29th day of June, 2010, and written notice was given on the 2nd day of July, 2010 in the manner and form and to the persons prescribed in Regulation 189/96.

3. THAT no notice of appeal setting out an objection to By-law 171-2010 was filed with me within twenty (20) days from the date of written notice of the passing of the by-law.

4. THAT By-law Number 171-2010 is deemed to have come into effect on the 29th day of June, 2010.

SWORN BEFORE ME in the City of Vaughan, in the Regional Municipality of York, this 23rd day of July, 2010.

JEFFREY A. ABRAMS

A Commissioner, etc.

James Todd Coles,
a Commissioner, etc.,
Regional Municipality of York, for The Corporation of the City of Vaughan.
Expires March 27, 2013.
THE CITY OF VAUGHAN

BY-LAW

BY-LAW NUMBER 171-2010

A By-law to amend City of Vaughan By-law 1-88.

WHEREAS the matters herein set out are in conformity with the Official Plan of the Vaughan Planning
Area, which is approved and in force at this time;

AND WHEREAS there has been no amendment to the Vaughan Official Plan adopted by Council but
not approved at this time, with which the matters herein set out are not in conformity;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the City of Vaughan ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. That City of Vaughan By-law Number 1-88, as amended, be and it is hereby further amended by:

a) Rezoning the lands shown as "Subject Lands" on Schedule "1" attached hereto, from A
   Agricultural Zone and C6 Highway Commercial Zone to EM2 General Employment Area
   Zone and EM3 Retail Warehouse Employment Area Zone, in the manner shown on the said
   Schedule "1".

b) Deleting Exception 9(394) from Section 9.0 "EXCEPTIONS" and substituting therefor the
   following paragraph:

   *(394) Notwithstanding the provisions of:

   a) Subsection 2.68 respecting the Definition of a Lot;
   b) Subsection 6.1.6 b) Landscaping Requirements, respecting minimum
      landscape strip widths along a lot line adjacent to an arterial road;
   c) Subsection 6.5.1 a) respecting uses permitted in an EM3 Retail Warehouse
      Employment Area Zone;

   the following provisions shall apply to the lands shown as "Subject Lands" on
   Schedule "E-412":

   ai) for the purpose of zoning conformity, the lands shown as Subject Lands on
       Schedule "E-412" shall be deemed one lot, regardless of any future division
       of said lands;
   bi) the minimum landscape strip width adjacent to Regional Road 50 shall be
       6.0m alongside a building that is setback 6.0m from Regional Road 50 and
       that contains windows facing Regional Road 50;
   bi) the minimum landscape strip width adjacent to Huntington Road shall be
       6.0m;
   ci) the following additional uses, pursuant to Section 2.0 Definitions shall be
       permitted in the EM3 Retail Warehouse Employment Area Zone up to a
combined maximum of 1800m²:
- Eating Establishment;
- Eating Establishment with Outdoor Patio;
- Eating Establishment, Convenience
- Eating Establishment, Take Out, with Outdoor Patio;
- Personal Service Shop;
- Convenience Retail Store;
- Bank and Financial Institution.

c) Deleting Schedule "E-412" and substituting therefor the Schedule "E-412" attached hereto as Schedule "1".

d) Deleting Key Map 10B and substituting therefor the Key Map 10B attached hereto as Schedule "2".

2. Schedules "1", and "2" shall be and hereby form part of this By-law.

READ a FIRST, SECOND and THIRD time and finally passed this 26th day of June, 2010.

Linda D. Jackson, Mayor

Jeffrey A. Abrams, City Clerk
THIS IS SCHEDULE 'E-412'
TO BY-LAW 1-88, SECTION 9(394)

NOT TO SCALE

THIS IS SCHEDULE '1'
TO BY-LAW 171 - 2010
PASSED THE 29th DAY OF JUNE, 2010

FILE No. Z.07.041
LOCATION: PART OF LOT 8, CONCESSION 10
APPLICANT: 1693143 ONTARIO INC. & 1693144 ONTARIO INC.
CITY OF VAUGHAN

SIGNING OFFICERS

MAYOR

CLERK
KEY MAP 10B
BY-LAW No. 1-88

THIS IS SCHEDULE '2'
TO BY-LAW 171 - 2010
PASSED THE 29th DAY OF JUNE, 2010

FILE No. Z.07.041
LOCATION: PART OF LOT 8, CONCESSION 10
APPLICANT: 1693143 ONTARIO INC. & 1693144 ONTARIO INC.
CITY OF VAUGHAN

SIGNING OFFICERS

MAYOR

CLERK
SUMMARY TO BY-LAW 171-2010

The lands subject to this By-law are located on the east side of Regional Road 50, through to Huntington Road and north of Fogal Road, municipally known as 8151 Regional Road 50, in Part of Lot 8, Concession 10, City of Vaughan.

The purpose of this by-law is to rezone the subject lands from A Agricultural Zone and C6 Highway Commercial Zone to EM2 General Employment Area Zone and EM3 Retail Warehouse Employment Area zone with site specific exceptions for landscape strips widths, the definition of a lot and to permit the following additional uses in the EM3 Retail Warehouse Employment Area Zone up to a combined maximum of 1800m²:

- Eating Establishment;
- Eating Establishment with Outdoor Patio;
- Eating Establishment, Convenience
- Eating Establishment, Take Out, with Outdoor Patio;
- Personal Service Shop;
- Convenience Retail Store;
- Bank and Financial Institution.
LOCATION MAP
TO BY-LAW 171 - 2010

FILE No. Z.07.041
LOCATION: PART OF LOT 8, CONCESSION 10
APPLICANT: 1693143 ONTARIO INC. & 1693144 ONTARIO INC.
CITY OF VAUGHAN
June 10, 2010
File No. 3975

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

Dear Sir:

Re: Draft City of Vaughan Official Plan - April 2010
1693143 Ontario Inc. and 1693144 Ontario Inc. ("the Owners")
8151 Highway 50
East side of Highway 50, south of future Ebenezer Road extension
File#OP.25.1

On June 8, 2010, Council approved the Owners’ application to rezone their 3.98-ha parcel at the above location to EM2 and EM3 in accordance with the Official Plan (OPA 450) and the approved Block Plan.

We have reviewed the draft, City-wide, comprehensive Official Plan and note that Prestige Employment designations are proposed for the Highway 50 and Huntington Road frontages of the Owner’s lands, and General Employment for the lands in the interior of the site.

The above proposed land use designations are not consistent with the approved Block Plan, which places a Prestige Employment designation on the west half of the property, with frontage on Highway 50, and a General Employment designation on the east half of the property, with frontage on Huntington Road. The proposed land use designations accordingly do not match the approved rezoning categories.

We note also that the proposed land use policies would significantly reduce the range of commercial uses permitted within the Prestige Employment designation.

We understand that the City intends to proceed expeditiously with a zoning by-law review to implement the new Official Plan following its adoption. Since the draft Official Plan does not contain a general recognition for uses previously approved through a rezoning process, and...
since there is no site-specific official plan policy proposed for this location, the Owner’s property would be vulnerable to a City-initiated downzoning that would significantly reduce the range of permitted commercial uses, and which would re-arrange the location of the permitted uses on the property.

The Owners have expended considerable efforts to achieve a rezoning in conformity with the City’s existing policies, and accordingly requests that the new Official Plan contain appropriate provisions to protect its zoning approval. This approach would be consistent with the recently adopted York Region Official Plan which contains policies recognizing prior approvals. A site-specific policy governing these lands will probably be required.

We would be pleased to provide any clarification that may be required with respect to the foregoing.

Yours truly,
Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Per:

[Signature]

Alan Young, BES MSC MCIP RPP
Senior Associate

cc. Susie Iacobucci
John Zipay, City of Vaughan
Diana Birchall, City of Vaughan
Grant Ueyama, City of Vaughan
Ryan Mino, City of Vaughan
Pino DiMascio, Urban Strategies
Emily Reisman, Urban Strategies
September 22, 2010

Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge St.
Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1

Attention: Mr. Denis Kelly
Regional Clerk

Dear Mr. Kelly,

Re: City of Vaughan Official Plan Review
Amendment 2010 to the Official Plan for the City of Vaughan

We are writing on behalf of our client, Euro Estates Ltd., the owners of approximately 8.6 ha, located in the northwest quadrant of the Carrville Centre as shown on Attachment 1 (the subject lands), to its Section 11.2 including Map 11.2.A - Carrville Secondary Plan Land Use.

The subject lands were originally included within the Carrville District Secondary Plan (OPA 651). Schedules A and B to the Secondary Plan, as well as the Appendices clearly identified the approved land uses, heights and densities, by block. The subject lands were designated High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Park, Valleyland and Woodlot, and Stormwater Management. A site specific policy (7) permitted small lot single detached units in the Medium Density Residential designation adjacent to the Valleyland as shown on Attachment 2.

Following the approval of the Secondary Plan, a Landscape Master Plan and Urban Design Guidelines for the Carrville District Centre were completed. Our client participated in these processes, however, they continued to have concerns with respect to the Master Plan recommendations. The Master Plan exercise was not intended to be a Secondary Plan review and the City had advised that the Master Plan would not result in significant changes to the approved Secondary Plan, as it affected the subject lands.

On August 25th, when my client was out of the country, the City of Vaughan released to the public the staff report and associated Carrville Secondary Plan (as part of the overall City of Vaughan Official Plan Review). The proposed official plan amendment was considered at a public hearing on September 2nd, recommended for approval by Committee of the Whole and adopted by Council on September 7th, 2010. It has been forwarded to the Region for approval.

We submitted a letter to Special Committee on September 2nd, expressing our concerns about the amount of time provided for meaningful comment at the public meeting. Subsequently there was not enough time between the public meeting (the Thursday night before the Labour Day weekend) and the Council meeting...
(the Tuesday following the Labour Day holiday Monday) to meet with staff or to discuss appropriate modifications.

Our client has the following concerns with the proposed Secondary Plan as it affects its lands and/or any cost sharing agreements. As noted, Attachment 2 is the approved Secondary Plan and Land Use Schedule and Attachment 3 is the proposed Carrville Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule.

(a) The proposed Land Use Schedule does not accurately represent the top of bank (as identified by the TRCA). While we recognize that the Land Use Schedule is diagrammatic - it should be diagrammatically right, not wrong, in its depiction of the Natural Area designation. Attachment 4 illustrates the top of bank location.

(b) The storm water management pond, which appears to be somewhat smaller than the required area, has been shifted north so it is now bisected by the valley and the buffer area - a location which is clearly impractical.

(c) The actual area shown as valleyland is understated, giving the impression that there is more developable land north of the connecting road than is actually the case. We would note that the Secondary Plan proposes that a separate 10m buffer block be provided along the top-of-bank, which will further reduce the developable area north of the east-west road.

(d) With respect to the maximum and minimum heights proposed, and recognizing that taller buildings may be appropriate at the corner of the collector road and Dufferin Street, we would ask that the Secondary Plan include more general policies with respect to the heights of buildings, in order to allow greater flexibility as the lands develop over time.

(e) South of the east-west local road, the size of the park appears to have been increased although there is not any indication of its approximate size (as was the case in OPA 650). By our very rough calculation it would occupy at least 10% of my client’s property within the Centre.

(f) The Secondary Plan requires that all parkland be designed and built to the satisfaction of the City. No indication is given as to who will share in the cost of this work - a matter of particular concern given the size of the park in relation to my client’s total holding in the Centre.

(g) A High Rise residential designation has been introduced immediately west of the park, with no indication of the how public road access is to be provided - as the north-south local street which existed in OPA 650 has been eliminated.

(h) The minimum and maximum height of this new High Rise residential block has been established at 6 storeys. This maximum/minimum restriction provides no flexibility in the design and marketing of this block - we would ask that the minimum heights be reduced to 3 storeys.
(i) Permission for single detached lots on the north side of the east-west local street has been eliminated (a site specific policy in OPA 650). We would ask that this permission be re-instated.

(j) York Region Transit (YRT) has not identified the need for a transit facility in Carrville, nor has the nature of any such facility been defined in any way. However, YRT has advised that they will continue to use the existing bus routes (on perimeter Carrville Roads) and will not require any facilities outside the dedicated rights-of-way. We would ask therefore that this reference to a transit facility be removed.

Accordingly, in order to address these issues we are requesting that the amendment be modified as follows:

a) The Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule
   • should reflect the valleylands, identified by the established top-of-bank as shown on Attachment 4;
   • should place the storm water pond on the tableland;
   • should permit small lot single detached units within the Low Rise Mixed Use designation;

b) The Secondary Plan Text
   • should permit building heights within the Low Rise Mixed Use designation of between 2 - 4 storeys;
   • should permit building heights within the High Rise Residential west of the Park of between 3 - 6 storeys;
   • should permit building heights within the High Rise Residential north of the east-west local road of 2 - 16 storeys;
   • should identify the approximate size of the proposed park;
   • should include policies to clarify that the park will not be dedicated in its entirety by the owner, but that the parkland dedication will be in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act;
   • should include policies with respect to the equitable cost sharing of required facilities including the provision and improvement of parkland; and
   • should eliminate references to the Transit Facility (Section 11.2.5.6).
We look forward to reviewing these proposed modifications with Region of York Planning staff.

Yours truly,

Bousfields Inc.

[Signature]

Lindsay Dale-Harris  M.Sc.(Pl)  MCIP, RPP
LDH/kh:jobs

cc. Dinko Musich, Euro Estates
    John Zipay, City of Vaughan, Planning Commissioner
EMC File No.: 210162-PL
February 3, 2011  
 Via Email bryan.tuckey@york.ca and Mail

Planning and Development Services Department  
Regional Municipality of York  
17250 Yonge Street  
Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1

Attention:  
Bryan Tuckey, MCIP, RPP  
Commissioner, Planning and Development Services

Dear Sir:

Re:  
‘Adopted’ City of Vaughan Official Plan (2010)  
7034 Islington Avenue  
Part of Lot 23, Plan 9691  
(north-west corner of Islington Avenue North and Steeles Avenue West)  
Community of Woodbridge, City of Vaughan  
Regional Municipality of York

Please be advised that we act as the land development planning consultants on behalf of the owner of the above-notify holdings within the City of Vaughan. Subsequent to the September 7, 2010 ‘adoption’ of the new City of Vaughan Official Plan document by City Council, we requested:

1. receiving the ‘notice of decision’ associated with Region of York approval of the local Official Plan (October 12, 2010 letter to Denis Kelly, Regional Clerk attached for easy reference); and

2. a change to the land use designation on Schedule 13-Q: Land Use contained within the City of Vaughan Official Plan, 2010 document (November 29, 2010 email transmittal to Diana Birchall, Vaughan Director of Policy Planning and Urban Design also attached for easy reference).

As indicated in the attached copy of Vaughan Official Plan (2010) Schedule 13-Q: Land Use, the subject lands remain designated as “General Employment” while the adjacent surrounding lands immediately to the north and south are designated as “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use”. We would suggest that retaining such an existing designation on the lands is problematic introducing issues of compatibility and does not represent good planning nor is based on sound planning principles.

As the Region of York deliberates on the new proposed City of Vaughan Official Plan (2010) document as part of the review and approvals process, and prior to approving the document, we respectfully request that the lands be subject to a ‘modification’ associated with Schedule 13-Q: Land Use and be redesignated to the more appropriate “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use” land use designation accordingly. In addition, the “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use” land use designation should also reflect the density and height policy provisions of the abutting lands, thus including the notation “H 9” and “D 2.75” on Schedule 13-Q to correspond with the vision for the abutting lands.
We understand that the local Official Plan has now been forwarded to the Region of York, as the approval authority, and as such, we formally request:

1. being notified of the preparation, as well as receiving any Regional Planning Department staff reports and the ‘draft notice of decision’ (proposed modifications and deferrals) related to the proposed City of Vaughan Official Plan;

2. being notified in advance of scheduled dates as to Regional Planning & Economic Development Committee and/or Council consideration of the Plan document;

3. an opportunity to convene a review meeting relative to the subject lands and the requested ‘modification’ with both Regional and City Planning staff to address our submission comments; and

4. that City Planning staff confirm whether the intent of the Official Plan was to retain a remnant industrial employment designation surrounded by a mid-rise residential mixed-use lands or whether the designation on Schedule 13:Q was merely an oversight and an error of omission as part of the mapping exercise.

Given our concern with respect to the ‘adopted’ City of Vaughan Official Plan (2010) document as it affects the subject lands, we reserve the right to provide further submissions and review comments at the appropriate point in time and prior to the overall process culminating with issuance of any approvals by the Region of York. We further reserve our ‘right of appeal’ should the matter not be addressed nor resolved to the satisfaction of the property owner.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter and we look forward to further deliberations and discussions with both Regional and City Planning staff.

Yours truly,

EMC GROUP LIMITED

Yuriy Michael Pelech, MA(PI), MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

atts.

c.c. John Zipay, City of Vaughan Commissioner of Planning (John.Zipay@vaughan.ca)
     Mario Tedesco, Mardave Construction Limited (Mario.tedesco@mardave.ca)

Z:\210162\210162 YR PlgDept VOP Ltr Feb0311
EMC File No.: 204101-PL
October 12, 2010

Via Fax 1-905-895-3031

Regional Municipality of York
Corporate Services Department
York Region Administration Building
17250 Yonge Street
4th Floor
Newmarket, ON
L3Y 6Z1

Attention: Denis Kelly
Regional Clerk

Dear Sir:

Re: Official Plan for the City of Vaughan (2010)

Further to the recent September 7, 2010 ‘adoption’ by City of Vaughan Council of the new and updated City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010, coupled with submission to the Regional Municipality of York as the approval authority, please be advised that as per the circulated ‘notice of City Council adoption’, we respectfully request receiving a copy of the ‘notice of decision’ associated with Regional approval of the Official Plan document.

Thank you very much for your attention to and cooperation with our request.

Yours truly,

EMC GROUP LIMITED

Yuri M. Pelech, MA(Pl), MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

c.c. York Region Planning & Development Services (Fax #1-905-895-3482)
    Jeffrey A. Abrams, Vaughan City Clerk (Fax #905-832-8535)
    Diana Birchall / Mauro Peverini, Vaughan Policy Planning (Fax #905-832-8545)
Good morning Diana:

Please be advised that we have been retained by the owner of 7034 Inslington Avenue (situated on the west-side of Islington Avenue immediately north of Steeles Avenue West) to review and assess development opportunities for the subject lands under the new and recently adopted City of Vaughan Official Plan.

As indicated by the attached copy of Schedule 13-Q: Land Use, the subject property is designated as "General Employment" while the surrounding lands to both the north and south are designated as "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use". As such, we ask that you kindly please confirm whether:

1. the intent of the new Official Plan was indeed to retain a small industrial employment designation surrounded by the new mid-rise mixed-use residential designation;
2. the designation was an oversight and an error of omission; and
3. the "General Employment" designation can be replaced with the more appropriate "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation as part of a City and/or Region of York initiated "modification" to the Plan document as same is reviewed and considered for approval by the Region.

Thank you very much for your attention to our inquiry and should we need to meet to discuss the matter further, we ask that you please advise accordingly and we will attend as required. Regards.

Yurij Michael Pelech, MA(Pl), MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
EMC GROUP LIMITED
Engineers, Planners, Project Managers
7577 Keele Street, Suite 200, Concord, Ontario L4K 4X3
T. (905) 738-3939 F. (905) 738-6993
www.emcgroup.ca

To help us stop the spread of viruses, we request that all email sent to our office includes project name, number, and recipient's name in the subject line.

CONDITIONS OF RECEIPT OF DIGITAL DATA

In the event of a dispute over inconsistencies between documents contained in the attached storage media and the original documents retained by EMC Group Limited, those retained by EMC Group Limited shall constitute the original document for record keeping purposes. Unauthorized alteration, copying or use of this digital data shall be deemed an infringement of the Canadian Copyright Act. Information contained in this transmission may be of a preliminary nature or subject to revision. The receiver is responsible to confirm the validity of it prior to using it for any purpose authorized by the act of distribution. Electronic copies of engineering plans prepared by EMC Group Limited are NOT to be used for construction layout purposes. The receiver of such electronic files is to refer to legal plans prepared by the surveyor as well as standard detail drawings and
Diana,

Further to my previous email there are also various new policies that have been added which were not included in the original OPA 713. The staff report clearly states that the changes should have no impact on the effect or purpose of the plan. This OPA was meticulously negotiated and agreed to by all parties and the changes do not reflect the negotiated agreement. In particular policy 12.7.4.7 was never agreed to and was not part of the approved OPA 713. As such this needs to be deleted. Furthermore it is inconsistent with the approved zoning by-law for the site. We never agreed, nor our we able to provide primary entrance along Major Mackenzie and Cityview Blvd. This issue was negotiated as part of the overall design and in its place we agreed to the pedestrian promenade.

Other policies which extend beyond what was approved in OPA 713 are:

- 12.7.4.7 (as previous discussed)
- 12.7.5.7
- 12.7.6.2
- 12.7.6.11 (the bylaw specifies which entrances will be primary on the promenade)

I will be sending you a complete list of issues shortly.

Thanks,
Paula

SmartCentres
Paula Bustard M.P.L. | Director Land Development | Phone: 905-760-6200 ext. 7266 | Fax: 905-760-6202 | Cell: 416 949-1377
[ 700 Applewood Cres., Suite 100, Vaughan, Ontario, L4K 5X3 ]
Further to my voicemail, the volume 2 site specific polices for our Weston and Major Mackenzie site are not correct. There were changes made by the Region which were not included in the new plan as shown in the staff report. A couple of these changes were errors that were made in the maximum GFA. These errors were acknowledged by Vaughan and the Region made the required changes. I have attached the modifications below. Furthermore, the mapping is incorrect as the Village District and Commercial District are switched. Lastly, the map shows a gateway feature on our northeast boundary of the site. This is behind some of our buildings and the intent was always to make a gateway feature midblock along Weston Road as this is the primary signalized access.

Can you please let me know when these changes have been made. I appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Thanks,
Paula

---

Hi Paula,

As per our telephone conversation this morning, attached are the draft modifications for OPA 713. I will be sending out the Notice of Decision later this afternoon.

Also attached is our fee by-law, in which you’ll find the required fee in Row 5 of Schedule “A”. The amount is $2260.

Give me a call or respond to this email if you have any questions.

Mike Mallette
Attachment 1

City of Vaughan Official Plan Amendment No. 713

MODIFICATIONS

1. Modify Section I – PURPOSE by deleting the second paragraph and replacing it with the following paragraph:

“The subject Amendment is to facilitate a retail commercial development proposing a total gross floor area (GFA) of 52,810 m2 for the lands shown as “Area Subject to Amendment No. 713” on Schedule “I” attached hereto in accordance with the following:”

2. Modify Section I. G) 2) by deleting the words “shown on Attachment #2” so that the section reads as follows:

“G) 2) “the determination of the future land uses, including the disposition of the road network respecting the southerly extension of Zachary Place and the disposition of the north/south traversing 9 m pedestrian walkway, and transition between the zoned residential land for Plan of Subdivision 19T-00V03 (Lormel Developments [Weston] Inc. and Ozner Corporation [South]) and the retail commercial uses proposed for the subject lands;”

3. Modify Section II – LOCATION by adding the word “and” before the word “are” in the first sentence and by replacing the word “intersection” with the word “corner” in the second sentence and placing a period at the end of the sentence so that the paragraph reads as follows:

“The lands subject to this Amendment, hereinafter referred to as the "Subject Lands", comprise approximately 19.19 ha, and are shown on Schedules "1", "2", "3" and "4", attached hereto, as "Area Subject to Amendment No. 713". The Subject Lands are located at the north-east corner of Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Dr.”

4. Modify Section IV 2. by replacing the letter “B” after the word “Schedule” with the letter “A”, by deleting one of the quotation marks before the word “Medium”, and deleting the semi-colon after the words “District Centre Commercial” so that the section reads as follows:
"2. Deleting Schedule "A" to OPA #650, as amended, and substituting therefor Schedule "A" attached hereto as Schedule "3", thereby redesignating the Subject Lands shown as "Area Subject to Amendment No. 713" on Schedule "1", attached hereto, from "Low-Rise Residential" and "Medium Density Residential/Commercial" with the "9 m Pedestrian Walkway" to "District Centre Commercial" with the "Pedestrian Only Promenade", "Urban Square" and "Greenway System" overlay designations;"

5. Modify Section IV 3. by replacing the number "5" after the word "Schedule" with the number "4" so that the first sentence reads as follows:

"3. Deleting "Appendix A - Commercial Space, Housing Units, Employment and Population Estimates" to OPA #650, and substituting therefor "Appendix A - Commercial Space, Housing Units, Employment and Population Estimates", attached hereto as Schedule "4" to indicate the following;"

6. Modify Section IV 3. i) by replacing the words “North-east Quadrant” in each bullet point with the words “combined Quadrants”.

7. Modify Section IV 3. ii) by replacing the words “North-east Quadrant” in each bullet point with the words “combined Quadrants” and by replacing the words ““Village Core” designation” with the words ““Village Core” and “District Centre Commercial” designations”.

8. Modify Section IV 3. ii) by replacing the numbers “2170” and “2500” to “1840” and “2170” respectively under the third bullet so that the third bullet section reads as follows:

- increasing the number of employees in the “Village Core” and “District Centre Commercial” designations from up to 460 employees to up to 790 employees resulting in an increase of 330 employees for a revised Total number of employees for the combined Quadrants from up to 1840 employees to up to 2170 employees;"

9. Modify Section IV 3. ii) by inserting the word “to” after the word “devoted” under the sixth bullet so that the sixth bullet section reads as follows:

- decreasing the area of land devoted to parkland within the “Village Core” and “District Centre Commercial” designations from 0.4 ha to 0 ha resulting in an decrease of 0.4 ha for a revised Total parkland for the combined Quadrants from 1.2 ha to 0.8 ha;
10. Modify Section IV 4. by deleting the paragraph in its entirety and replacing it with the following paragraph:

"4. Adding the following to Sub-section 3.2.5 of OPA 650, Parks, after paragraph j):

(OPA #713)

k) Pursuant to the Planning Act, the Owner shall convey parkland consisting of approximately 0.137 ha located at the most north-easterly boundary of the Subject Lands, shown as "Neighbourhood Park" on Schedule "1" to OPA #713. Further, the Owner shall pay cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication for the remaining parkland requirement at 2% of the value of the lands in accordance with Section 42 of the Planning Act prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. (OPA #713)"

11. Modify Section IV 5. by inserting the words "In OPA #650," at the beginning of the section so that the beginning of the section reads as follows:

"5. In OPA #650, adding the following after Sub-section 3.2.7, Library:"

12. Modify Section IV 5. by deleting Section 3.2.8.2 a) in its entirety and replacing it with the following Section 3.2.8.2 a):

"3.2.8.2 a) The Village Core area shall be the location of the most compact development form within the Amendment Area. The Village Core shall be an area of mixed-use retail commercial and office development, combining high order retail uses and eating establishments. The focus of the retail/office development within the Village Core shall be to a "Village Core Promenade"; a pedestrian oriented promenade consisting of a walkable main street shopping and social area linked by a series of urban squares. Residential uses, appropriately integrated into the Village Core area, are also permitted."

13. Modify Section IV 5. by replacing the words "mid-to-small" with the word "small" in Section 3.2.8.4 a) so that Section 3.2.8.4 a) reads as follows:

"3.2.8.4 a) The District Centre Commercial area is intended to be primarily larger scale retail commercial development located away from Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive and small scale development located closer to Weston Road and Major Mackenzie Drive."
14. Modify Section IV 5. by replacing the number “5,500” with the number “24,810” in Section 3.2.8.4 c) so that Section 3.2.8.4 c) reads as follows:

“3.2.8.4 c) The lands within the District Centre Commercial area may accommodate development up to a maximum Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 24,810 m2 east of Vellore Park Avenue (extension) and up to a maximum GFA of 11,000 m2 west of Vellore Park Avenue (extension).”

15. Modify Section IV 6. by adding the words “Policies that shall require commercial” before the word “Development” in Section 4.5 b) i) so that the Section reads as follows:

“4.5 b) i) Policies that shall require commercial development to be in accordance with a comprehensive design scheme to be approved by the City, laying out the general orientation, configuration, massing and scale of major buildings and structures, and parking areas, together with access points, traffic circulation, pedestrian circulation, landscaping and buffering;”

16. Modify Section IV 6. by adding the following Sub-section 4 after Sub-section 3 in Section 4.5.1. c) i):

“4.5.1 c) i) 4. York Region is protecting for a 45 metre right-of-way on Major Mackenzie Drive and a 43 metre right-of-way on Weston Road through this area. All municipal setbacks shall be referenced from a point 22.5 metres and 21.5 metres from the centreline of construction of Major Mackenzie Drive and Weston Road, respectively.”

17. Modify Section IV 6. by replacing Section 4.5.1. c) ii) 1. with the following Section 4.5.1. c) ii) 1.:

“4.5.1 c) ii) 1. The Village Core Promenade shall reflect its role and function to provide vehicular and transit vehicle access as well as a high level of pedestrian and cycling amenity.”

18. Modify Section IV 6. by replacing Section 4.5.2. c) i) 1. with the following Section 4.5.2. c) i) 1.:

“4.5.2 c) i) 1. Vellore Park Avenue and Cityview Boulevard shall provide vehicular and transit vehicle access, as well as a high level of pedestrian and cycling amenity at the entrances to the District Centre.”
19. Modify Section IV 6. by adding the word “shall” after the word “objectives” in Section 4.6 a) so that Section 4.6 a) reads as follows:

“4.6 a) Sustainable community objectives shall be implemented through neighbourhood designs that supports cycling and walking, ensures neighbourhood connectivity to the broader community, and provides transit opportunities, water and energy efficiencies, energy alternatives and green building design and site development. (OPA #713)"

20. Modify Section IV 9. by adding the words “, close to building entrances” after the words “activity areas” in Section 6.4.1. b) so that the section reads as follows:

“6.4.1 b) An adequate supply of secure bicycle parking shall be provided near transit stops, in high activity areas, close to building entrances, and open space areas.”

21. Replace Schedule “4” with Schedule “4” attached hereto.
THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK

BILL NO. 94

BY-LAW NO. A-0393-2007-091

A By-law to prescribe fees for processing planning applications

WHEREAS Section 69 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, (the "Act"), provides that the council of a municipality may by by-law establish a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to establish a tariff of fees to help defray the anticipated cost of the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of The Regional Municipality of York hereby enacts as follows:

1. Every person who makes an application of a type listed in Column 1 of Schedule “A” during the calendar years commencing February 1, 2008, February 1, 2009 and February 1, 2010, shall pay the fee set out opposite such application in Columns 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

2. The fees listed in Schedule “A” shall be payable at the time of making the application, or as otherwise provided in the by-law.

3. Schedule "A" hereto shall form part of this by-law.

4. This by-law shall take effect on February 1, 2008.

ENACTED AND PASSED this 13th day of December, 2007.

Denis Kelly                           Bill Fisch
Regional Clerk                       Regional Chair

Authorized by Clause 5, Report 10 of the Planning and Economic Development Committee, adopted by Regional Council at its meeting on December 13, 2007.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION</td>
<td>February 1, 2008 Rate</td>
<td>February 1, 2009 Rate</td>
<td>February 1, 2010 Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. For a Regional Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>$12,525</td>
<td>$12,900</td>
<td>$13,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For Notice of a Public Meeting for a Regional Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For Notice of Receipt of an Application to Amend the Regional Official Plan</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
<td>$8,000 or actual cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For Regional approval of a major area municipal Official Plan Amendment, but shall exclude amendments initiated by the area municipality for policy changes or clarifications to the Official Plan</td>
<td>$7,710</td>
<td>$7,940</td>
<td>$8,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For Regional approval of an area municipal Official Plan Amendment that does not require circulation to external agencies or a report to Regional Council, but shall exclude amendments initiated by the area municipality for policy changes or clarifications to the Official Plan</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>$2,195</td>
<td>$2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For comment to an area municipality on a request for exemption from Regional approval of a locally significant Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>$2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. For Regional approval of a second and subsequent phase of a plan of subdivision where approval of a final plan is phased</td>
<td>$1,005</td>
<td>$1,035</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To review an application to an area municipality for approval of a draft plan of subdivision</td>
<td>$2,405</td>
<td>$2,475</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To review a revised application to an area municipality for approval of a draft plan of subdivision</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To review an application to an area municipality to change the conditions of approval of a draft plan of subdivision</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. For clearing Regional conditions for second and subsequent phases of a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>$935</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To review an application to an area municipality for approval of a draft plan of condominium</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To review a revised application to an area municipality for approval of a draft plan of condominium</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To prepare a record in the event of a referral or appeal of an application to the Ontario Municipal Board</td>
<td>$430</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. For the preparation of a Regional Development Charge Agreement, payable prior to the execution of the agreement by the Regional Corporation</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>