



**WESTON  
CONSULTING**

planning + urban design

City of Vaughan  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan ON  
L6A 1T1

**Attn: Jeffrey Abrams, City Clerk**

<b>C 13</b>
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>
CW (PH) - <u>Nov 1/16</u>
ITEM - <u>2</u>

November 1, 2016  
File 6728/6729

Dear Sir,

**RE: Community Area Policy Review For Low-Rise Residential Designation  
Amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010**

Weston Consulting was the former planning consultant for Centra (Keele) Inc. and has since been retained by Laurier Group, the new owners of the lands in the City of Vaughan municipally known as:

1. 9785 and 9797 Keele Street and a parcel known as PCL-176; and
2. 9560 and 9570 Keele Street (collectively the 'subject lands').

This letter is provided in response to the Staff Report and document entitled *Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study* prepared by Urban Strategies dated October 2016. This letter is further to the correspondence provided on May 31, 2016 and October 5, 2016 in response to the document entitled *Draft Policy Review: Vaughan Community Areas and Low-Rise Residential Areas Study*, dated January 2016 and September 2016 respectively.

The above noted lands are designated Low Rise Residential in the City of Vaughan Official Plan ("VOP") and are within the Maple Heritage Conservation District. We have submitted development applications for the subject lands, which are under review.

We are in review of the Staff Report and appended report prepared by Urban Strategies which was made available on Thursday October 27, 2016 for the following upcoming Public Hearing held on Tuesday November 1, 2016 with regard to the *Community Area Policy Review for Low Rise Designations Proposed Amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan 2010*. This Staff Report and appended Draft Report prepared by Urban Strategies was provided five days prior to the scheduled public hearing. The Planning Act requires a notice to be circulated 20 days prior to the public meeting which includes *where and when a copy of the proposed official plan or plan amendment and information and materials will be available to the public for inspection*. As we understand, a copy of the proposed Official Plan Amendment has yet to be made available to the public and the circulated notice does not specify when the Official Plan Amendment will be

released. As such, we respectfully request that the public hearing for this item be deferred until the public has had an opportunity to review the proposed Official Plan Amendment document.

In addition, the document provided and proposed policy do not address the principles of clergy and transition for applications currently in process. In order to ensure fairness and clarity regarding the interpretation of any guidelines and policy we recommend the introduction of transition clauses within the proposed Official Plan policies for comments received and items already addressed. This would provide clarity in relation to the applicable policies for applications that were submitted under the existing policy framework such for the applications for the above noted subject lands.

Based on our review, we do not support the policy changes to 2.2.3.2, 9.1.2.1, 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.3, 9.1.2.4, 9.1.2.5, 9.2.2.1, 9.2.3.1, 9.2.3.2 and 9.2.3.3. In particular, proposed policy 9.1.2.4 addresses lots on Arterial Streets and specifies numerical requirements of front and rear yard setbacks. We reiterate that these provisions should not be contained in an Official Plan and should be assessed at the Zoning By-law stage of the development process. This policy also prohibits frontage on private driveways and laneways. This policy inhibits appropriate infill development and densities which in our opinion are appropriate on Arterial Roads that are planned for higher order transit. Inhibiting appropriate density on Arterial Road is contrary to intensification principles in the Growth Plan to the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Provincial Policy Statement, and Regional Official Plan Policies. Furthermore, the proposed policy changes are inconsistent with other applications and developments that have been approved on the basis of these planning principles.

It is our opinion, that the proposed policies as a whole are too prescriptive and restrictive from Official Plan documents and are contrary to the direction proposed at the Provincial policy level. We appreciate the Committee's consideration of the above comments and we request to continue to be provided with any further notice of any meetings, reports or draft policies in relation to this matter. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (ext. 241) or Julia Pierdon (ext. 307).

Yours truly,  
**Weston Consulting**  
 Per

Ryan Guetter, BES, MCIP, RPP  
 Vice President

c. John MacKenzie, City of Vaughan  
 Aaron Platt, Davies Howe  
 Clients