

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – AUGUST 31, 2010

OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW – VOLUME 1 CITY-WIDE POLICIES RESPONSE TO PUBLIC, GOVERNMENT AND AGENCY SUBMISSIONS FILE 25.1 WARDS 1 TO 5

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Planning recommends:

1. THAT the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan, Volume 1 (April 2010) be amended in accordance with the recommendations set out in Attachment No.1 to this report;
2. THAT the revised version of Volume 1 proceed to Council for adoption at the Council meeting of September 7, 2010 as part of Volume 1 of the Official Plan; and that the plan reflect the changes approved by the Committee of the Whole at this meeting; and
3. THAT Section 10.1.1.5 of Volume 1 of the new Official Plan be amended to include policies related to the content of a Development Concept Report and Phasing Plan for Secondary Plans as outlined in this report.

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".

Economic Impact

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

Communication Plan

The project status, analysis and results of the Official Plan review have been communicated to the public through an extensive engagement and consultation process.

A Public Open House was held on May 3, 2010 which provided an opportunity for the public to comment on the draft Official Plan and a Public Hearing was held on May 17, 2010. On consideration of the submissions at the May 17, 2010 Public Hearing Meeting, the Committee of the Whole adopted a resolution scheduling a Special Committee of the Whole Meeting for July 28, 2010, to consider a report and recommendations by the Commissioner of Planning following the review of the comments received during and since June 14, 2010 (the identified deadline for comment) on the new Official Plan. On July 28, 2010, the Special Committee of the Whole considered the report and recommendations of the Commissioner of Planning and deputations made at the meeting.

Purpose

To provide a follow up technical report and recommendations from the Commissioner of Planning in regard to additional comments received on the new City of Vaughan Official Plan (Volume 1) emerging from the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole meeting.

Background –Analysis and Options

Location

The new Official Plan applies to all lands within Vaughan. The submissions received and summarized on Attachment No. 1 apply to the lands identified in each individual letter.

City of Vaughan Official Plan

The new Vaughan Official Plan will be produced in two volumes: Volume 1 will include City-wide policies and Volume 2 will contain the five secondary plans resulting from the focused area reviews (the North Kleinburg-Nashville, the Woodbridge Centre, the Yonge Steeles Corridor, the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, and the West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plans) and a consolidation of approved area and site-specific policies and secondary plans which are being carried forward with the new Official Plan.

Official Plan Designations

The draft Official Plan introduces a set of land use designations and policies 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 read and understand the detailed land use information presented thereon, including the maximum permitted heights and densities. More specific policies and designations will apply to areas identified in Volume 2, as set out in Schedule 14. This includes the retention of several previously adopted secondary plans, the focused area secondary plans (e.g. the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan), and a number of area and site specific plans.

Zoning

The provisions of Zoning By-law 1-88 will remain in effect until they are updated or replaced by zoning consistent with the Official Plan including Volume 2. With approval of the Official Plan, it is anticipated that the preparation of a new by-law will be commenced to bring the City's Zoning By-law into conformity with the new Official Plan. A budget and work plan to include the zoning review in the 2012 budget will be prepared for consideration by Council next year.

Council Direction

On July 28, 2010 the Special Committee of the Whole adopted the following recommendation (in part):

- "1) That the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan, Volume 1 (April 2010) be revised in accordance with the recommendations set out in Attachment No. 1 of the report dated July 28, 2010 and Attachment No. 1 of the memorandum dated July 23, 2010 of the Commissioner of Planning;"

Additional Submissions Received and Recommendations

Subsequent to the Special Committee of the Whole meeting of July 28, 2010, additional submissions have been received by the City. The submissions generally fall into three categories: respondents reiterating their comments and identifying additional concerns about the policies and land use designations affecting their properties; additional information being provided in response to Staff's comments and recommendations in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole report; and new submissions received after the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole meeting. The submissions have been recorded, reviewed and a recommendation provided in a manner consistent with PART B (Summary of Respondents Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations) of the Committee of the Whole Staff Report (July 28, 2010). The analysis is summarized on Attachment 1 to this report.

Period for Accepting Comment

The draft Official Plan was made available for comment on April 27, 2010 and Council, through its June 8, 2010 ratification of the Committee of the Whole recommendation, set June 14, 2010 as the final date for submissions. However, staff has continued to accept submissions and have endeavoured to respond to those submissions received before August 12, 2010. If additional submissions are received they may be addressed through the Region of York's approval process.

Submissions Review

Several objectives were used as the basis for analyzing the submissions made by landowners, public agencies, the development industry, residents and interest groups regarding the proposed Secondary Plans. In particular, to ensure that the new Official Plan principles were maintained, that senior level policy direction was conformed to (e.g. Regional Official Plan, Places to Grow), and that sound planning principles were adhered to. In addition, meetings were held with a number of respondents to clarify issues and discuss potential solutions.

Each submission was considered on its own merit and recommendations made on appropriate responses and actions. As a tool for the efficient and thorough review of submissions, a matrix was established to set out the content of the submissions and the recommended responses to each letter. The summary matrix forms the basis of Attachment No. 1 and presents information in tabular form as follows:

PART A: An index of correspondence for Part B identifying each response by item number, correspondence date, name and subject/location.

PART B: A summary of the response/concerns/requests and staff comments and the related recommended policy and mapping changes.

The summaries in PART B contain the following:

- The Item Number related to the number in the Part A Correspondence Index
- The Submission Date and respondent identification
- The correspondence content, as summarized by Staff
- Staff comment on the submission
- Staff recommendation on the submission.

The following approach was applied in the application of each of the summaries:

- Each submission was evaluated on its own merits, and provided with a response
- Multiple submissions pertaining to one property(s) or issue(s), from a person, firm or agent, could be combined to provide a single response
- Submissions pertaining to one property or issue, from more than one person, firm or agent, could be combined or have a single response
- Where a submission(s) and the Staff comment are the same as those considered in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole staff report, the item in Part B of the original report has been referenced.

The summary will form part of the public record of the supplementary comments received on Volume 1, and will be forwarded to the Region of York in accordance with the approval process under the Planning Act.

Development Concept Report and Phasing Plan for Secondary Plans

To provide a context for coordinated development, and to demonstrate conformity with the policies of the Official Plan where a Secondary Plan is required, Staff recommends that policies

be added to the Official Plan to provide a framework for the issues to be assessed where a Development Concept Report is required. The recommended policies are as follows:

10.1.1.5 To provide a context for coordinated development, and to demonstrate conformity with the policies of the Secondary Plan, each development application, in particular those applications intended to develop over a number of phases, shall include a Development Concept Report, providing a detailed description of the proposed development, and the manner in which it addresses the policies of the Secondary Plan. The Development Concept Report may form part of the justification for a development application as determined through a pre-consultation meeting with the Planning Department and address the following matters:

- a. phasing of development, from initial construction to ultimate completion;
- b. achievement of the transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented uses;
- c. how the development has regard for the land use and design policies of neighbouring municipalities where appropriate;
- d. height and massing of buildings;
- e. distribution of land uses, lot sizes and densities;
- f. relationship between streets and buildings, including how the proposed development and subsequent phases address any Secondary Plan policies respecting build-to lines;
- g. how the street-related retail uses are being provided in the current phase of the application;
- h. integration of development with transit services;
- i. pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation networks and integration with the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, as appropriate;
- j. parks and open space system;
- k. location, dimensions and character of publicly accessible private open spaces and pedestrian routes, showing their continuity and complementary relationship to adjacent public spaces, pedestrian routes and streets;
- l. general location, size and treatment of parking facilities and vehicular access points, including the potential for shared parking, parking ramps and loading facilities and access and identification of streetscape improvements and relationship to public sidewalks and pedestrian routes.
- m. signage, streetscape amenity elements, lighting and site furnishings.
- n. location, size and design of stormwater management facilities;
- o. identification and design of streetscape and pedestrian route improvements for the entire subject property including the area from the building face to the curb, with respect to the provision of street trees (including a double row of trees on major Avenues, where feasible such as, Highway 7, Steeles Avenue and Yonge Street), signage, street furniture, landscaping, street and pedestrian scale lighting;
- p. location of street-related uses and principal pedestrian building entrances to street frontages, and how the role of the public street and pedestrian movement along the street are supported;
- q. micro-climatic conditions, modifications or enhancements;
- r. cultural heritage resources, and proposed measures to conserve them;
- s. proposed measures to remediate and restore significant natural features and conditions, and to address other environmental matters, consistent with the City's Environmental Management Guideline;
- t. protection and enhancement of significant views and landscape focal points; and,
- u. energy conservation and other proposed sustainability features of the development.

10.1.1.6 In evaluating development applications throughout the Secondary Plan Area, the City shall consider:

- a. the support the proposed use provides to the operation of the local, regional and inter-regional transit network in both the short and long term;
- b. the ability of the existing transit network to support the proposed development;
- c. the availability of water and sewer services and related Regional Allocation Capacity;
- d. the suitability of the proposed stormwater management facilities;
- e. compatibility with adjacent approved land use designations in proximity to the proposed use;
- f. compatibility of the proposal with the urban design policies and principles described in the Official Plan/ Secondary Plan and with the Zoning Bylaw.
- g. the proposed parking areas and access points;
- h. phasing may be addressed through the appropriate use of the policies of the Secondary Plan respecting the application of the Holding Symbol in the implementing Zoning By-law;
- i. identifies the expected financial requirements for such public infrastructure, and the appropriate financial contributions from benefiting landowners where applicable;
- j. the impact of traffic on adjacent existing and/or approved land uses, and the short and long –term impact of the proposed use on the operation of the regional and local road network;

10.1.1.7 In addition to the studies listed in 10.1.3.3, following the completion of a Development Concept Report and prior to the approval of any development application, the City may require the preparation of additional studies:

- k. community services needs assessment and delivery strategy;
- l. public art delivery strategy;

The City shall establish specific requirements for studies addressing the foregoing concerns with development proponents. The costs associated with the conduct of these studies shall be the responsibility of the landowners and be shared equitably among benefiting landowners on a pro-rata basis.

10.1.1.8 Within each block of the Secondary Plan, development applications should co-ordinate neighbouring development proposals in a mutually complementary fashion. Non-participating lands in the block shall be shown conceptually in the Development Concept Report and Phasing Plan.

10.1.1.9 Phases are to be based upon the existence of, or commitment to construct, the following infrastructure elements, where applicable:

- m. Components of the local and primary road network;
- n. bus-rapid transit;
- o. subway; and
- p. public and community services.

(add to Holding By-laws)

10.1.2.7 Where a Development Concept Report has been prepared per policy 10.1.1.5 the City may enact a Holding By-law if:

- a. the Development Concept Report, submitted in support of a development application has not been finalized to the City's satisfaction;
- b. the number and location of access points to the site are inadequate to function safely and efficiently; and,

- c. where development relies upon other matters occurring first, such as the consolidation of land ownership or completion of a development agreement, to ensure the orderly development of the project, and/or to secure funding and/or to equitably cost-share among benefiting landowners, for sewer, water, stormwater, roads, parks, community services and facilities, or outstanding application processing fees.

Transition Period

In the period between the adoption and final approval of the Official Plan and Volume 2, the City will be operating with the existing official plan policies still in full force. It is expected that applications to amend the existing Official Plan and Zoning By-law 1-88 will continue to be submitted during this period. In evaluating these applications, conformity to the new Official Plan will be taken into consideration. The objective is to bring any such amendments into conformity with the intent of the new Official Plan and Secondary Plans. While not in force, the Official Plan and Secondary Plans represent the City's most contemporary expression of planning principles, developed over several years through extensive study and public consultation. This approach will help to ensure that the integrity of the new plan is maintained during the transition period.

Direction to finalize the new Official Plan for adoption on September 7, 2010 was received at the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the whole meeting. As well, a resolution specifying that all applications for official plan and zoning by-law amendments, received between the adoption and final approval of the Plan by the Region of York, will be evaluated on the basis of both the existing and new Official Plan policies. This will help to ensure that the integrity of the new plan is maintained during the transition period.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020

The new Official Plan is addressed under the objectives "Plan and Manage Growth and Economic Vitality".

Regional Implications

The new Official Plan has been prepared in consultation with the Region of York staff and is in conformity with the Region's Official Plan. The Plan relies on the population and employment forecasts of the Regional Official Plan, which was adopted in December 2009. The Regional Official Plan is currently awaiting approval by the Province. The City's Official Plan has been prepared to conform to the Regional Official Plan.

Next Steps

The recommended changes on Attachment 1 to the April 2010 draft of the new Official Plan (Volume 1) directed by the Committee of the Whole as a result of this report, will be incorporated into the final draft of the Official Plan. The Official Plan will be considered by Council on September 7, 2010. If adopted, the new Official Plan will be forwarded to the Region of York for their consideration and final approval.

Conclusion

At the Special Committee of the Whole meeting of July 28, 2010, and following the meeting, a number of additional submissions were received by the City in response to Volume 1 of the new Official Plan. Requests for changes to the plan primarily focus on specific areas of policy or specific lands which may be effected by a policy or a land use designation(s). Each submission was considered on its merits taking into consideration the principles of the new Official Plan, the need to ensure continuing conformity with senior level policy direction and adherence to sound planning principles.

It is recognized that there may be issues that will not be resolved to the satisfaction of some of the respondents upon the City's approval of the new Official Plan. This may result in appeals,

which may ultimately proceed to the Ontario Municipal Board for adjudication. Post-approval negotiations may proceed during the Region of York's review process, with the opportunity for modifications prior to, and during any OMB proceeding.

Therefore it is recommended that the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan, Volume 1 (April 2010) be modified in accordance with the recommendations contained in this report. It is further recommended that Staff proceed with revisions to the plan, incorporating the approved changes recommended herein and that the revised Official Plan be forwarded to Council for adoption at its September 7, 2010 meeting.

Attachments

1. Summary of Submissions, Staff Comments and Recommendations: Draft City of Vaughan Official Plan (Volume 1) April 2010.
2. Correspondence pertaining to the Draft City of Vaughan Official Plan (Volume 1) (Mayor and Members of Council ONLY).

Report prepared by:

Arto Tikiryan, Senior Planner, ext. 8212

Respectfully submitted,

John Zipay
Commissioner of Planning

Diana Birchall
Director of Policy Planning

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
7E	July 26, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	Vaughan Mills Primary Centre- West side of Jane Street
12C	July 26, 2010	Chippewas of Rama	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
14D	July 28, 2010	Land Law	8100 Yonge Street
19C	July 27, 2010	Bousfields Inc.	Block 27
19D	July 22, 2010	Bousfields Inc.	Block 27
19E	July 22, 2010	Bousfields Inc.	Block 27
27B	August 4, 2010	Naser Gjureci	15 Lansdowne Ave.
42D	July 27, 2010	Drazen Bulat	Highway 7 and Kipling Ave
43B	July 27, 2010	Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC)	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
44B	July 27, 2010	Sciberras Consulting Inc.	10980 Kipling Avenue

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
44C	July 28, 2010	Davis Webb LLP	10980 Kipling Avenue
44D	August 10, 2010	Davis Webb LLP	10980 Kipling Avenue
46C	June 7, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	Northwest corner of Weston Road and Kirby Road
48G	July 2, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	Vaughan 400 North Employment Area
48H	July 26, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	Vaughan 400 North Employment Area
55B	July 28, 2010	MHBC Planning	140 Northview Boulevard and Northwest corner of Highway 400 and Major Mackenzie Drive
56B	July 28, 2010	Lormel Homes	3660 Rutherford Road
62B	July 28, 2010	Lormel Homes	Block 272, 65M-3898, and Zachary Place (Southeast corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard)
63D	July 16, 2010	Pound & Stewart	Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent
63E	July 23, 2010	Pound & Stewart	Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
65C	July 29, 2010	Miller Thomson LLP	9 property, parish and mission interests throughout Vaughan
69B	July 23, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7
73C	July 28, 2010	Wood Bull LLP	North side of Highway 7, west of Highway 427
85B	July 22, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	10951 Kipling Avenue
86B	July 22, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	Humber North Extension Area
90C	July 28, 2010	Parente, Borean LLP	8294, 8298 and 8302 Islington Avenue
97B	June 3, 2010	Delta Urban Inc.	Highway 50 to the west, Huntington Road to the east, between Major Mackenzie and Nashville Road.
97C	July 27, 2010	Delta Urban Inc.	Highway 50 to the west, Huntington Road to the east, between Major Mackenzie and Nashville Road.
105C	July 21, 2010	IBI Group	Interchange lands between Highways 400, 407 ETR, Highway 7, and Jane Street
134B	July 26, 2010	Embee Properties Limited	9771 - 9799 Jane Street & 9930 - 9980 Dufferin Street

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
135B	July 28, 2010	Cam Milani	Milani Blvd.
142B	July 5, 2010	Evans Planning	1118 and 1136 Centre Street
142C	July 28, 2010	The Vogue Development Group Inc.	1118 and 1136 Centre Street
142D	July 5, 2010	Evans Planning	1118 and 1136 Centre Street
144B	May 17, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	10056 and 10068 Keele Street
144C	July 28, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	10056 and 10068 Keele Street
154B	July 28, 2010	Cam Milani	Milani Blvd.
164B	June 27, 2010	Humphries Planning Group	77 Woodstream Boulevard
171B	July 21, 2010	Rita Salini	Northeast corner of Highway 50 and Langstaff Road
172B	July 28, 2010	Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association	Land along the Highway 7 corridor in proximity to Wigwoss Drive

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
197	July 16, 2010	G. Ahmadi	2057 Major Mackenzie Dr.
240	July 2, 2010	Glen Shields Soccer Club, Filipino Canadian Association of Vaughan	Patricia Kemp Community Centre
241	July 5, 2010	Norstar Building Corporation	1176 Rutherford Road
248B	August 5, 2010	Wood Bull LLP	Northwest corner of the intersection of HWY's 400 and 7 (the "Calloway Lands")
248C	August 5, 2010	Wood Bull LLP	Northwest corner of the intersection of HWY's 400 and 7 (the "Calloway Lands")
263	July 26, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	Lot 25, Chrislea Road
264	July 26, 2010	History Hill Group	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
270	July 27, 2010	Davies Howe Partners	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
271	July 21, 2010	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Vaughan Draft Official Plan

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
275	July 16, 2010	Pound & Stewart	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
277	July 23, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	10090 Huntington Road
280	July 26, 2010	Major Mackenzie Property Limited	9801-9855 Jane Street and 2933-2963 Major Mackenzie Drive
282	July 27, 2010	Aird and Berlis LLP	50 and 60 Disera Drive (YRSCC Property)
287	July 26, 2010	Gowlings	Drive-Through Facilities
289	July 28, 2010	Davis Legal Advisors	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
293	July 27, 2010	Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association (KARA)	Official Plan Review
295	July 28, 2010	Frank Greco	9560 Islington Ave.
301	July 21, 2010	Diane Nasr O'Young, Kayo O'Young	5737 Kirby Rd.
302	July 27, 2010	Canadian Petroleum Products Institute	Vaughan Draft Official Plan

Attachment 1**PART A: Index of Correspondence for PART B****Summary of Respondents' Requests/Concerns and Staff Comments and Recommendations**

Item	Date	Respondent	Subject/Location
306	July 29, 2010	Jeffrey Stone	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
310	July 28, 2010	Weston Consulting Group Inc.	Vaughan Draft Official Plan
312	July 23, 2010	Pound & Stewart	Regalcrest Court
320	August 6, 2010	EMC Group Limited	Part Lot 24, Concession 8
322	August 12, 2010	EMC Group Limited	Part Lots 19 and 20, Concession 8
323	July 29, 2010	Wood Bull LLP	SmartCentres Inc.

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>7E</p>	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Casertano Development Corporation and Sandra Mammone</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan Mills Primary Centre- West side of Jane Street</p>	<p>1) Concern that provisions of Section 9.2.1.2 which states that variations must be minor would generate debate. Request that the term "minor" be deleted as this is interpreted as meaning between 5% to 10%. In some cases greater variation is appropriate.</p> <p>2) The "High-Rise Mixed-Use" designation should also permit low-rise buildings.</p> <p>3) Request that Section: 9.2.2.6 be amended by including the following policy:</p> <p>(iii) Low-Rise Buildings, but only where accompanied by one or more Mid-Rise or High-Rise Building(s) on the same lot.</p>	<p>1) Built form flexibility is provided for in Section 9.2.1.2. Minor variations from the policies of Section 9.2.3 do not require an amendment to the Plan provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City. The interpretation of the term "minor" will be determined through the development review process.</p> <p>2) The High-Rise Mixed-Use designation is proposed primarily in Intensification Areas, well served with existing or planned transit. Low-rise buildings are permitted within transition areas to Low-Rise Residential and on local streets in the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p> <p>3) No changes are proposed to permit low-rise buildings in the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation. See Comment 2) above.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>
<p>12C</p>	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Chippewas of Rama</p>	<p>A confirmation letter indicating they received notification of the Special Committee of the Whole Meeting City of Vaughan Draft Official Plan-Volume 1.</p>	<p>Receipt of letter acknowledged.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: First Nation</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>			
14D	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Land Law</p> <p>FOR: Haulover Investments Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: 8100 Yonge Street</p>	<p>These comments were considered as Item 14A of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010. Proponent reviewed staff comments and provides additional comments for Issues 1) through 18).</p>	<p>Staff has reviewed the additional information and maintains the comments provided to Item No.14A of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
19C	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Block 27 Landowners' Group</p>	<p>Concern about the timing of the Secondary Plan preparation particularly as it specifies that "at least three of the required Secondary Plan Area Plans should be substantially advanced before the commencement of the studies for new community area blocks..." They contend that this policy is unnecessary, and is potentially counter productive in terms of growth management.</p>	<p>The Committee of the Whole on July 28, 2010, recommended the following (in part):</p> <p>"2) That the following recommendations be adopted:</p> <p>a) Under the Section "Timing of Secondary Plans in New Development Areas" the following policy be added to Section 10.1.1 "Secondary Plans" of Section 10.1</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: Block 27</p>		<p>“Implementing the Plan.”</p> <p>In order to achieve orderly managed growth and development within the City, as constituted through intensification within the current urban boundary area and expansion of the urban boundary area into New Community Area blocks, it is the policy of Council that the sequencing of the preparation of “Required Secondary Plans”, as shown on Schedule 14, “Areas Subject to Volume 2 Policies”, will be at the direction of Council with the proviso that the commencement of the preparation of these plans, must give priority to the Required Secondary Plan Areas, which are located within the urban boundary existing prior to the new urban boundary expansion. Further, the general principle will apply that no studies shall be undertaken with respect to new community areas outside the current urban boundary until the six required Secondary Plans, within the urban boundary, are completed. ”</p>	
<p>19D</p>	<p>DATE: July 22, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p>	<p>Reference is made to a 2.4 ha cultivated field in Lot 28, which is incorrectly identified as a “Core Feature” and designated as “Natural Area”.</p>	<p>The City concurs with the respondent’s letter. Additional information provided identifies an open field between the railway and the woodland identified as Stand 27-06 in the Focus Rural Area Woodland Ecosystem Assessment. The</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 2 to remove a portion of the “Core Features’ to reflect the findings of the Focus Rural Area Woodland Ecosystem Assessment in the vicinity of Stand 27-06.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: Block 27 Landowners' Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 27</p>		<p>appropriate schedules should be amended to modify Core Features and/or Enhancement Areas boundaries to remove the open field as noted on the maps attached to the letter dated July 22, 2010.</p>	<p>Amend Schedules 13 and 13-I to remove a portion of the "Core Features" to reflect the findings of the Focus Rural Area Woodland Ecosystem Assessment in the vicinity of Stand 27-06 and show such lands as "New Community Areas".</p>
<p>19E</p>	<p>DATE: July 22, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Bousfields Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Block 27 Landowners' Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 27</p>	<p>It is requested to delete subclause 9.2.2.13 b) regarding the requirement for one Secondary Plan process for the new community areas and clarify that Policy 9.2.2.13 d) ii applies only to Blocks substantially within the Humber River watershed based on evidence that the TRCA recommendation for an updated hydrologic study pertains only to the Humber River Watershed and not the Don River watershed.</p>	<p>TRCA confirms in a July 29, 2010 letter to the Region of York, copied to the City of Vaughan, that the need for a watershed-scale study to determine the hydrologic impact of development beyond the current urban boundaries is particular to the Humber River and Rouge River watersheds. Nevertheless, updated hydrologic studies related to issues such as, but not limited to, downstream erosion effects and headwaters evaluation are required for the Don River watershed.</p> <p>The issue of an updated watershed-scale hydrologic study is one factor in determining the utility of one comprehensive and coordinated Secondary Plan process for the New Community Areas. More importantly, the Region of York policies regarding New Community Areas support one coordinated secondary plan process to efficiently address healthy communities and sustainability through such</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>requirements as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - secondary plan preparation to include an innovative approach that involves a multidisciplinary team assembled by the local municipality in order to ensure an integrated and sustainable approach to the planning, design and approval of the secondary plan (in Policy 5.6.1); - comprehensive master environmental servicing plan prepared and implemented to examine all water systems in a comprehensive and integrated manner to increase efficiencies, maximize water conservation and minimize stormwater volume; - completion of a mobility plan; - preparation of a Regional Greenlands System Plan; and - that New Community Areas be designed to include an integrated open space network that includes both active recreational facilities and meeting places, urban squares, parks, outdoor seating and informal gathering spaces generally within 500 metres of all residents. 	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>In summary, the City confirms the utility and efficiency of one comprehensive and coordinated Secondary Plan process for the New Community Areas. It is not recommended to delete subclause 9.2.2.13 b). As a result, it is not required to distinguish the New Community Areas in Policy 9.2.2.13 d) ii regarding the completion of a sub-watershed study either preceding the secondary plan or concurrent with it.</p>	
<p>27B</p>	<p>DATE: August 04, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Naser Gjureci</p> <p>LOCATION: 15 Lansdowne Ave.</p>	<p>This letter was submitted in response to Item 27 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010. Requests reconsideration of the request for higher density, with a similar land use designation as 4 and 8 Lansdowne Avenue (Low-Rise Mixed-Use) on the property.</p>	<p>The request has been reviewed and the comments provided for the previous response to Item 27 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010 remain applicable.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
<p>42D</p>	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Drazen Bulat</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 7 and Kipling Ave</p>	<p>1) The OMB decision respecting OPA #661 excluded the properties fronting onto Lansdowne Avenue which are identified as "Low-Rise Mixed Use" on Schedule 13 Q of the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>2) OPA #661 provides for a maximum building height of 4 storeys and a FSI of 1.5 within 30 metres of a "Low Density" residential designation. The letter requests that Schedule 13-Q be amended to lower the maximum</p>	<p>1) As identified in Item 42C in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report, the lands at the northwest corner of Highway 7 and Lansdowne Avenue have been designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" to reflect the existing health centre on the property and is considered appropriate. The designation is being applied to this property independent of the OMB decision and OPA 661. As previously recommended, the maximum</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>building height from 5 storeys to 4 storeys and the FSI from 1.75 to 1.5 on the lands designated "Low-Rise Mixed-Use" on the south side of Highway #7, west of Kipling Avenue.</p> <p>3) Staff should ensure that Volume 2 of the Draft Official Plan reference and include the OMB Order dated July 8, 2009, which approved modifications to OPA No. 661 and include the other corners of Kipling Avenue and Highway 7.</p>	<p>building height should be reduced to 3 storeys.</p> <p>2) In the July 28, 2010 Committee of the Whole Report it is recommended that the policy respecting the 4 storey maximum building height within 30 m of a residential designation be incorporated into Volume 2. However, since the lands would be subject to the Transit Stop policies under OPA #661 a maximum FSI of 3.0 would be permitted.</p> <p>3) This issue is addressed through the policies and an additional Schedule in Section 12.2.11 (Volume 2).</p>	
<p>43B</p>	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC)</p> <p>FOR: Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure (MEI)</p> <p>LOCATION: North side of Highway 7, east of</p>	<p>The respondent met with the City on August 17, 2010 and provided further information and correspondence from the development review process regarding the delineation of the development limits on the Ontario Realty Corporation lands.</p>	<p>There are no development approvals in place relating to these applications. Given the lack of approvals, the available published information, and the letter from TRCA deferring to the City on decisions regarding the Natural Heritage Network (NHN), it is not appropriate for the City to make a major change to the designation of the ORC lands. Hence, the City's comment and recommendation for Item 43 - 1) in Attachment 1, Part B of the Special Committee of the Whole report of July 28, 2010 that the "extent of the NHN beyond the valleyland will be determined through the development review process" remains accurate. The</p>	<p>Schedule 2 be amended to align the Core Features boundaries to the extent of the Regionally Significant Forests and TRCA Regulated Area on the ORC lands. Schedule 13 and 13-S be amended to align the Natural Areas to the extent of the Regionally Significant Forests and TRCA Regulated Area on the ORC lands. Schedule 13 and 13-S be amended to show the lands outside of the Core Features as High-Rise Mixed-Use.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Bowes Road (abutting rail line)		<p>current application can proceed under the policies in force and effect at the time the application was filed and in accordance with Recommendation 1 b) of the Special Committee of the Whole report of July 28, 2010.</p> <p>A significant portion of the ORC lands are identified as Regulated Area defined by TRCA and as a Regionally Significant Forest identified by the Region of York. The Regionally Significant Forest above the top of bank also generally coincides with areas identified as Existing Natural Cover (forest) by the TRCA in the Don River Watershed Plan - Implementation Guide. The NHN includes all Regionally Significant Forests. Hence, the Core Features boundary above the top of bank can be modified to include only the Regionally Significant Forests and Regulated Area rather than the entire ORC lands.</p>	
44B	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Sciberras Consulting Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Schickedanz Bros.</p>	<p>1) Object to their client's lands being designated as "Natural Areas" on Schedule 13-B. Their objection is based on the City's definition of Core Feature as set out in Section 3.2.4 Vaughan's Natural Heritage Network. They state that a large portion of the area identified by the City is actively farmed and does not contain features as sited by the City.</p>	<p>1) The approximately 111 hectare property at 10980 Kipling Avenue is largely within the Greenbelt Plan area. An approximately 37.5 hectare portion at the northeast of the property is outside of the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System overlay of the Greenbelt Plan. This portion of the property includes a watercourse at the north end.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 10980 Kipling Avenue</p>	<p>Specifically object to the east-west linkage between the Humber River valley and Purpleville Creek.</p> <p>2) Suggest that criteria be provided by T.R.C.A for the review of Core Features and such policies should be included as an appendix to the plan.</p> <p>3) It is also suggested that until draft urban design guidelines are prepared, specific design policies should be removed or the use of the term "shall" be replaced by "should".</p> <p>4) The limits of the Greenbelt Plan as established by the Province should be clearly demarcated in the Official Plan and the Secondary Plan Schedules.</p>	<p>All watercourses, such as stream corridors, are identified as Core Features. Hence, the watercourse extending from the Greenbelt Plan area across to the Region of York Regional Greenlands System is identified as a Core Feature. Furthermore, Figure 7-1 of the Kleinburg-Nashville Community Plan: Natural Environment -Background Report (AGRA Earth and Environmental Ltd., 2001) identifies the watercourse as "Recommended Areas for Forest Regeneration to Enhance the Integrity of Forest Blocks and to Promote Intravalley Linkages".</p> <p>2) Policy 3.2.3.2 in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan refers to criteria developed by appropriate agencies, such as the TRCA and the Province (for example, the Ministry of Natural Resources). This information exists in current documents, such as TRCA's Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines (2007) and the Natural Heritage Reference Manual, Second Edition (2005) that may change from time to time. New documents produced by these and other appropriate agencies, such as York Region, may also provide criteria for further delineating Core Features boundaries. Hence, it is not</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>appropriate at the level of an Official Plan to set out specific criteria.</p> <p>Many issues raised in the letter regarding clarification of minor or major boundary adjustments can be determined during the Pre-Application Consultation as part of the development review process to prepare a Complete Application Package.</p> <p>3) Built form flexibility is provided for in Section 9.2.1.2. Minor variations from the policies of section 9.2.3 do not require an amendment to the Plan provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City. The interpretation of the term "minor" will be determined through the development review process.</p> <p>4) Schedule 2 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan clearly illustrates the Core Features in relation to the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan boundaries.</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>44C</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Davis Webb LLP</p> <p>FOR: Schickedanz Bros. Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 10980 Kipling Avenue</p>	<p>1) Objects to client's lands being designated as "Core Area" and Natural Area".</p> <p>2) Objects to Policies listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1.1 • 3.2.3.1 • 3.2.1.2 • 3.2.3.4 • 3.2.3.7 • 3.2.3.9 • 3.2.4.3 • 3.2.4.4 • 3.2.4.5 • 3.3.1 <p>3) Object to Official Plan as it does not contain adequate required definitions for the terms: "watercourse"; "stream corridor", and, "minor watercourse".</p> <p>4) Policies are vague, since,</p> <p>a) no reference is made to criteria provided by T.R.C.A.;</p> <p>b) the width of natural corridors not identified and no justification provided.</p> <p>c) no justification for requiring Core Features to be conveyed to the City or T.R.C.A.; and,</p> <p>d) no provision for permitting adjustments to the boundaries of the Core Areas and Natural</p>	<p>1) The approximately 111 hectare property at 10980 Kipling Avenue, incorrectly noted in the letter from Davis Webb Barristers and Solicitors as 1098 Kipling Avenue, is largely within the Greenbelt Plan area. An approximately 37.5 hectare portion at the northeast of the property is outside of the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System overlay of the Greenbelt Plan. This portion of the property includes a watercourse at the north end.</p> <p>All watercourses, such as stream corridors, are identified as Core Features. Hence, the watercourse extending from the Greenbelt Plan area across to the Region of York Regional Greenlands System is identified as a Core Feature. Furthermore, Figure 7-1 of the Kleinburg-Nashville Community Plan: Natural Environment -Background Report (AGRA Earth and Environmental Ltd., 2001) identifies the watercourse as "Recommended Areas for Forest Regeneration to Enhance the Integrity of Forest Blocks and to Promote Intravalley Linkages".</p> <p>2) The author of the letter does not provide specific details about the policies in question. The specific issues identified as points 1, 2 and 3 in the respondent's</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) That the term "minor watercourse" be replaced with "watercourse" throughout the Official Plan.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>areas.</p> <p>5) No justification provided for identifying Core Areas and Natural Areas on client's lands.</p>	<p>letter are addressed in 3) 4) and 5) below.</p> <p>3) The use of the terms watercourse and stream corridor have been in practical use in the planning literature since at least 1994 with the publication of the TRCA Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program. Stream corridor is defined on pages 13 to 16 of the Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program while watercourse is defined in the Glossary section of the same document.</p> <p>Questioning the use of the term "minor watercourse" is valid. This term does not appear in the TRCA Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program (1994). Therefore, it is recommended that all use of the term "minor watercourse" be replaced with the term "watercourse".</p> <p>4a) Policy 3.2.3.2 in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the Official Plan refers to criteria developed by appropriate agencies, such as the TRCA and the Province (for example, the Ministry of Natural Resources). This information exists in current documents, such as TRCA's Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines (2007) and the Natural Heritage Reference Manual, Second</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Edition (2005) that may change from time to time. New documents produced by these and other appropriate agencies, such as York Region, may also provide criteria for further delineating Core Features boundaries. Hence, it is not appropriate at the level of an Official Plan to set out specific criteria.</p> <p>References to appropriate criteria can be identified during the Pre-Application Consultation as part of the development review process to prepare a Complete Application Package.</p> <p>4b) The Official Plan schedules are not intended be interpreted at the scale of metres as it is a strategic document. Rather, policy allows for refinement of the Natural Heritage Network based on appropriate site-specific studies.</p> <p>Regarding the ecological buffers noted in Policy 3.2.3.4(a), a 10 m ecological buffer is City of Vaughan policy based on the Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program while a 30 m Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone applies to valley and stream Core Features also considered Key Natural Heritage Features or Key Hydrologic Features under the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, as</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>defined in these provincial plans.</p> <p>4c) Conveying open space into public ownership through the development review process is common practice. As these lands are often not considered part of the developable land base, public ownership serves the primary purpose of guaranteeing the lands are secured for the purpose of open space or cultural or natural heritage protection.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.3.9 refers to situations where “public ownership of all or part of the vegetation protection zone is not considered practical or feasible”, not to the Core Features.</p> <p>4d) Core Features policies have been recommended to be modified to allow for minor modifications to Core Features boundaries. This issue was addressed previously in the response to Item 19B - 2) and 3) of the Special Committee of the Whole report of July 28, 2010.</p> <p>5) All watercourses, such as stream corridors, are identified as Core Features. The only part of the property outside of the Greenbelt Plan area identified as a Core Feature is the watercourse that extends from the Greenbelt Plan area east to the Region of York Regional</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			Greenlands System. Furthermore, Figure 7-1 of the Kleinburg-Nashville Community Plan: Natural Environment -Background Report (AGRA Earth and Environmental Ltd., 2001) identifies the watercourse as one of the "Recommended Areas for Forest Regeneration to Enhance the Integrity of Forest Blocks and to Promote Intravalley Linkages".	
44D	DATE: August 10, 2010 RESPONDENT: Davis Webb LLP FOR: Schickedanz Bros. Limited LOCATION: 10980 Kipling Avenue	Request notification from the Clerk in writing if Council adopts the Official Plan.	The City Clerks Department will notify all individuals/companies with letters on record.	Not applicable.

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
46C	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: Kirwen Developments Inc. and Wallgate Investments Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest Corner of Weston Road and Kirby Road</p>	<p>Requests that further consideration be given to extend the urban boundary to include all four quadrants at Weston Road and Kirby Road. City should expand the urban boundary to include the northwest quadrant of Kirby and Weston Road.</p>	<p>Through the Official Plan process, the City has reviewed potential areas for urban expansion and the request cannot be supported.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
48G	<p>DATE: July 02, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: Vaughan 400 Landowners Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan 400 North Employment</p>	<p>1) Landowners do not want policies of Volume 1 to prevail where a matter is silent in OPA 637.</p> <p>2) OPA 637 Employment Lands Part A: Basis of the Amendment, Section 4 iii a) Prestige Areas-Office/ Business Campus, b) Employment Area Activity Centre, and c) Mixed Use Areas- Employment/Commercial need to be brought forward into the operative portion of OPA 637 in the new Official Plan. (Section B) These are new land use designations that have been established which did not exist in OPA 450 and are not in the proposed Official Plan.</p> <p>Section 4.0 iv) Policies Respecting Specific</p>	<p>1) OPA 637 has been included in Volume 2 as an area specific amendment and therefore all of the policies in OPA 637 will remain in effect. However, where OPA 637 is silent on policies included in Volume 1, those policies will apply to the OPA 637 Amendment area.</p> <p>2), 3), 4), 5), 6), and 7) OPA 637 is a site specific amendment being recognized in Volume 2. All existing land use permissions will be retained and recognized, including policies from the parent Official Plan Amendment (OPA 450) to maintain the intent and purpose of</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2), 3), 4), 5), 6), and 7) No change is recommended.</p> <p>8) No change is recommended.</p> <p>9) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Area	<p>Uses – discusses Section 2.2.7 of OPA as related to banquet halls. This section needs to be moved into the operative portion of the Secondary Plan (Section B) to ensure that it is carried forward into the new Official Plan as intended.</p> <p>3) Land Use Schedules. OPA 637 includes designations inclusive of Employment Area, Prestige and Employment Area General. These correlate to designations and policies contained in OPA 450.</p> <p>4) Part B – The Amendment Development Policies – Land Use from Section 2.2.1 – Employment Area, 2.2.3 – Prestige and 2.2.4 Employment area General of OPA 450 contain land use permissions for the area and need to be brought forward and recognized in Section B of OPA 637.</p> <p>5) Part B – Section A 10, and 12 regarding service nodes. Section 2.2.5 from OPA 450 needs to be brought forward for completeness (need to reaffirm there are no restrictions on gross floor area for uses contemplated in Volume 1).</p> <p>6) Part B – Section 14. This section requires urban design guidelines for the employment area. Expect that this will be completed as part of the block plan process and become a stand alone document. (Once approved the Vaughan</p>	<p>OPA 637.</p> <p>8) Where OPA 637 is silent on sustainability policies contained in Volume 1, they shall apply.</p> <p>9) Comment noted.</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>400 North Employment area would not be subject to the design related policies in Volume 1).</p> <p>7) Part B- Section 15. – Adds to section 2.3.2 of OPA 450. All of section 2.3.2 from OPA 450 should be brought forward into 637.</p> <p>8) Vaughan Official Plan Volume 1- Sustainability-Section 9.1.3.3- This should be completed at the block plan stage and upon completion of individual planning applications should not be subject to having to complete the same report. Blocks 34/35 will develop as anticipated by OPA 450 and OPA 637 by block plan development and the MESP requirements of those documents.</p> <p>9) OPA 637 redesignates a residential component of land for Estate Residential Uses. During preparation of OPA 637 that this area would be developed on full services, the requirement for the Estate Residential would be reviewed in the Official Plan review exercise. The draft Official Plan designates this residential component as Low Rise Residential. This designation is acceptable to the landowners group.</p>		

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
48H	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: Vaughan 400 North Landowners Group</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan 400 North Employment Area</p>	<p>Concern respecting OPA 637 and how it relates to the Volume 1 policies. Request confirmation that OPA 637 will not be subject to Volume 1 policies where OPA 637 is silent or policies included in Volume 1.</p>	<p>OPA #637 has been included in Volume 2 as an area specific amendment and therefore, all of the policies in OPA #637 will remain in effect. However, where OPA #637 is silent on policies included in Volume 1, those policies will apply to the OPA #637 Amendment area.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>
55B	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: MHBC Planning</p> <p>FOR: Home Depot Holdings</p> <p>LOCATION: 140 Northview Boulevard and Northwest corner of Highway 400 and Major</p>	<p>This is a follow up to their letter of May 11, 2010, Item 55 of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>1) The respondent is requesting the lands at the northwest corner of Highway 400 and Major Mackenzie Drive be designated "commercial Mixed-Use" with site specific policies.</p> <p>2) Regarding 140 Northview the respondent is requesting that an additional clause be inserted into the new Official Plan to recognize the existing uses and building constructed prior to the new Official Plan. In addition it requested that a site specific provision to recognize the existing store be included in the Official Plan.</p>	<p>1) The lands are currently designated "High Performance Employment area" by OPA 600 which permits limited retail, office and service commercial uses. The current land use permissions for the site are facilitated through Exception 9(1221) of By-law 1-88. The existing zoning would be maintained on the subject lands including retail warehouse permissions.</p> <p>2) In the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report it was recommended that a policy be added to recognize existing land uses (refer to Item No. 63-B, Recommendation No. 4). Recognition of the existing store is</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	Mackenzie Drive	3) Requesting that any sensitive uses developed on lands adjacent to the Home Depot site be required to undertake appropriate environmental studies (e.g. noise, dust, vibration, etc.) to be identified on a case by case basis in order to ensure land use compatibility with adjacent lands.	<p>facilitated through the recommended policy and the existing zoning.</p> <p>3) The Highway 7 Official Plan Amendments and OPA 500 which introduced the mixed use notion in these areas had no such policies. Adding the suggested policy would create a disincentive to mixed-use intensification in an area where it is being encouraged.</p>	
56B	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Lormel Homes</p> <p>FOR: West Rutherford Properties Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: 3660 Rutherford Road</p>	<p>This letter is a follow-up to Item No. 56 considered in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>1) The respondent has concern with the Staff recommendations. Would like to meet with Planning Staff to refine the Draft Official Plan prior to endorsement by the City.</p> <p>2) Requesting "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" designation be changed to "Mid-Rise Residential" to permit a residential condo building without a commercial component. A request is also made to increase the maximum height to 10 storeys and increasing the permitted FSI to 2.5.</p> <p>3) Commercial uses, particularly ground floor retail uses as required by the official plan are not viable in this location.</p>	<p>1), 2) and 3) Staff met with the respondent, has further reviewed the request and maintains the comments and recommendation contained in Item No. 56 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>1) No change recommended.</p> <p>2) No change recommended.</p> <p>3) No change recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>62B</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Lormel Homes</p> <p>FOR: Ozner Corporation (South)</p> <p>LOCATION: Block 272, 65M-3898, and Zachary Place (Southeast corner of Weston Road and Retreat Boulevard)</p>	<p>This letter is a follow-up to Item No. 62 considered in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>1) The respondent has concerns with the recommendations staff have made. Would like to meet with Planning Staff to refine the Draft Official Plan prior to endorsement by the City. They are proposing a 10 story terraced building and an FSI of 2.7.</p> <p>2) Note that Schedules 13 and 13-I have not been changed to reflect Staff's recommendations.</p>	<p>1) Staff met with the respondent, has further reviewed the request and maintains the recommendation identified in Item No. 62 of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>2) The Schedules will be revised when the final Draft Official Plan is prepared.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>
<p>63D</p>	<p>DATE: July 16, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>FOR: OPGI Management LP o/a Oxford</p>	<p>The respondent wishes to be notified of the adoption of the City of Vaughan Draft Official Plan-Volume 1.</p>	<p>The City Clerks Department will notify all individuals/companies with letters on record.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent</p>			
63E	<p>DATE: July 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>FOR: OPGI Management LP o/a Oxford</p> <p>LOCATION: Multiple properties on Royal Group Crescent</p>	<p>Letter respecting (Item No. 122) of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report indicating that a subsequent letter will be provided outlining their response to Staff's comments at a future date.</p>	<p>Receipt of the letter is acknowledged.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>
65C	<p>DATE: July 29, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Miller Thomson LLP</p> <p>FOR: Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of</p>	<p>Follow-up letter to Item No. 65A of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report, requesting the Clerk to provide written notification of any meetings, decisions or consideration of this matter by the Committee of the Whole or Council.</p>	<p>This request is noted.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Toronto</p> <p>LOCATION: 9 properties, parish and mission interests throughout Vaughan</p>			
<p>69B</p>	<p>DATE: July 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Woodbridge Farmers Co. Ltd., 1510904 Ontario Ltd. And 1510905 Ontario Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: East side of Highway 50 north of Highway 7</p>	<p>1) Request that the Service Node be moved to the future intersection approximately 500 metres north of Highway 7.</p> <p>2) Do not agree with Policy 10.2.1.4 which states: "For the purposes of delineating between Prestige Employment and General Employment land uses and between Commercial Mixed-Use and Prestige Employment land uses abutting an arterial street or provincial highway shall be interpreted to extend one lot depth up to 200 metres, in from the arterial street or Provincial highway."</p> <p>The respondent indicates that there is a shallow lot at the corner of Highway 7 and 50, which has a depth of 50 metres from Highway 7, the effect of the above policy would be to create an intensification corridor only 50 metres in depth. Accordingly, they request that this policy be reworded to delete the words one lot depth. The result would be to create an intensification corridor a full 200 metres in width, and would include both the shallow lot on the corner and a</p>	<p>1) The Service Node will be recognized as per the approved Block Plan.</p> <p>2) Staff concur that some flexibility in delineating the boundary between the designations can be accommodated.</p> <p>It is recommended that the existing policy in OPA 450 be adopted. Part of this policy was included in the Recommendation 1) for Item 17b) of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report. It is recommended that the full OPA 450 policy be adopted.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) That Recommendation 1) for Item No. 17b of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report be amended by adding the following:</p> <p>"It is intended that the extent of the various land use designations be established through the Block Plan process. The detailed boundaries would be reflected in the approved subdivision plans and zoning by-law.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		portion of our clients lands.		
73C	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP</p> <p>FOR: Seven 427 Developments Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: North side of Highway 7, west of Highway 427</p>	Concerned that Staff are not recommending any changes to the Official Plan with respect to the concerns raised in their letter of May 17, 2010. They urge that these concerns be addressed prior to any further consideration of the Draft Official Plan.	Staff has further reviewed the issues raised by the respondent and no change to the comments and recommendations for Item No. 73A of Special Committee of the Whole Meeting of July 28, 2010 are proposed.	No change is recommended.
85B	<p>DATE: July 22, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: 1539253 Ontario Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 10951 Kipling Avenue</p>	Requesting that a site specific policy be incorporated into the new Vaughan Official Plan recognizing the development application on the lands.	<p>This issue was addressed in the response to Item No. 85 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p> <p>Block 48 is entirely in the Greenbelt Plan area and identified as an Agricultural Area according to Map #8 of the Region of York Official Plan (adopted by Council in Dec. 2009). The Agricultural designation in the City Official Plan (Volume 1) is consistent with Region of York Official Plan. There is no Rural Areas designation in the new City Official Plan.</p>	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
<p>86B</p>	<p>DATE: July 22, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: Humber North Landowners</p> <p>LOCATION: West side of Highway 27 south of Kirby Road</p>	<p>The Staff response and comment to the May 18, 2010 submission is not technically correct. The Humber North lands are designated as "Suburban Residential" in OPA 601 and policy document requires a technical amendment be approved in conjunction with development</p>	<p>The lands are currently subject to unapproved development applications (Official Plan and Zoning Amendments and a Draft Plan of Subdivision). The lands are designated as "Town and Village" in the Regional Official Plan, requiring further comprehensive secondary plan approval. The lands are also subject to OPA 601 and designated Future Residential "Humber North Neighbourhood Extension Area" which includes policies that require further analysis be completed. The subject lands are designated in Schedule 1, Vol.1 Official Plan as "Community Areas". The lands are also designated as "Agricultural" in Schedule 13-G of Vol. 1 Official Plan.</p> <p>The "Community Area" designation on Schedule 1 recognizes the lands being in the City's urban boundary. Given that the lands are currently under review through the development application process, it is recommended that the lands remain designated 'Agricultural' in Schedule 13-G until such time as the necessary requirements of OPA 601 are satisfied. If the development applications are approved, Schedule 13-G can be amended to reflect any approvals.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
90C	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Parente, Borean LLP</p> <p>FOR: 2174824 Ontario Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 8294, 8298 and 8302 Islington Avenue</p>	<p>The letter elaborates on issue presented in Items 90A and 90B reviewed in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>	<p>See Comment under Item 90A and 90B of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
97B	<p>DATE: June 03, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Delta Urban Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Giampaolo Investments Limited and Vineview Development Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 50 to the west, Huntington Road to the east,</p>	<p>This issue was raised in Item No. 97 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p> <p>The letter states that the lands should be incorporated into the urban boundary since: this will promote the efficient use of water and wastewater infrastructure; lands have access to a future GO station along the Bolton route; and, supports the intent of the PPS and Places to Grow.</p>	<p>Through the Official Plan process, the City has reviewed potential areas for urban expansion. The lands are not identified for urban expansion and the request cannot be supported.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	between Major Mackenzie and Nashville Road.			
97C	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Delta Urban Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Giampaolo Investments Limited and Vineview Development Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Highway 50 to the west, Huntington Road to the east, between Major Mackenzie and Nashville Road.</p>	<p>(See Item No. 97B above).</p> <p>Request their client's lands (96 ha) located on the south side of Nashville Road between Huntington Road and Highway 50 be included in the City's proposed Urban Expansion lands and Urban Structure for development as employment lands.</p>	<p>Through the Official Plan process, the City has reviewed potential areas for urban expansion. The lands are not identified for urban expansion and the request cannot be supported.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
105C	<p>DATE: July 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: IBI Group</p> <p>FOR: 2748355 Canada</p>	<p>Respondent is concerned about a proposed Highway 400 crossing which would connect Colossus Drive and Interchange Way. In their previous letter they indicated that there was no justification provided by the City's staff or consultants.</p>	<p>Staff have met with the respondent to discuss this concern. The VMC Plan builds on the streets structure in OPA # 500. The proposed Hwy 400 flyover is necessary as determined by the VMC Transportation Study.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Interchange lands between Highways 400, 407 ETR, Highway 7, and Jane Street</p>			
<p>111E</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Helmhorst Investments Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest Quadrant of Major Mackenzie Drive and Bathurst Street</p>	<p>1) Requests the deletion of Enhancement Area on land identified for stormwater ponds on the Helmhorst lands.</p> <p>2) It is recommended that a policy be included after Section 3.2.3.4 to recognize minimum vegetation protection zones less than those specified in Policy 3.3.2.4 in those cases where the lands are part of an approved Block Plan.</p> <p>3) Concern over the deletion of linear parks and policies that exclude gateways as parkland dedication. They request that Section: 7.3.1.3 include greenways as being eligible for parkland credit.</p> <p>4) The respondent indicates that in OPA 600 lands north of Major Mackenzie Drive adjacent to Bathurst Street were designated Medium Density Residential – Commercial. They request that these lands be designated “Low-Rise Mixed-Use” to permit the same range of uses permitted in OPA 600.</p>	<p>1) The Helmhorst lands are subject to Zoning By-Law Amendment File Z.03.076 and Draft Plan of Subdivision File 19T-03V13. The Enhancement Areas shown on the Helmhorst lands in Block 12 include a stormwater pond and is intended to identify opportunities for naturalization when stormwater retrofits are planned. Any part of the Enhancement Areas in this part of Block 12 that overlap development approvals will be removed according to draft approved Plan of Subdivision 19T-03V13.</p> <p>2) Policy 3.4.1.16 reflects previous Ministry-approved policies in OPA 604, the City's conformity to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The City does not agree with the recommendation to add the suggested policy.</p> <p>3) The purpose of greenways is to serve as connecting links and not parkland.</p>	<p>1) Schedule 2, Schedule 13 and Schedule 13-J be amended to delete the Enhancement Area designation where it overlaps with lands designated for development in accordance with draft approved Plan of Subdivision 19T-03V13.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) That Section 10.1.2.2 9) e) be amended by deleting the existing policy and substituting therefore the following:</p> <p>“e. land that is planned as a school site for any school board that has jurisdiction in the area in which the land is situated be offered to the</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>5) Policy 10.1.2.28e requires conveyance of school sites at a price to be established at the day before draft plan approval. This is in accordance with Section 51(25.1) of the Planning Act, however, it has not been proclaimed and is therefore not in effect.</p> <p>6) A local convenience site is located at the intersection of Queen Filomena Avenue and Bathurst Street. There is no restriction in the approved zoning for the lands. The proposed Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation restricts the gross floor area to 1200m². They believe the site can accommodate up to 1800- 2000m² based on a 25-30% of the lot area. They request that the policy be revised to ensure a total of 2000m².</p>	<p>Parkland dedication for these lands is not supported.</p> <p>4) The approved Block 12 Plan includes a commercial Block. The lands are designated “Low Density Residential” which permits local convenience commercial centres.</p> <p>A new definition for retail was provided by Staff under Item No. 11 of the July 28, 2010, Special committee of the Whole Report. The new definition is as follows:</p> <p>“retail shall mean retail, restaurants and service commercial uses”</p> <p>This definition will allow current retail permissions on the site to be maintained. In addition, in the Staff Report changes were recommended to the drive-through policies that would permit drive-throughs on properties that are not located on Regional Corridors.</p> <p>5) The respondent is correct. It is recommended that a more general policy be included in the Official Plan requiring conveyance of school sites in accordance with the Planning Act.</p> <p>6) Staff concur with the comment and recommend that the reference to</p>	<p>school board in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act”.</p> <p>6) Section 9.2.2.2 e) be amended as follows:</p> <p>“In areas designated as Low-Rise Mixed-Use and located in Community Areas identified on Schedule 1, retail and office uses will be limited to a maximum of 500 square metres of gross floor area if located on a collector street as indicated on Schedule 9.”</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>maximum gross floor area for retail/office uses on an arterial street be deleted.</p>	
<p>115</p>	<p>DATE: June 07, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: City-wide</p>	<p>1) Goal #4, VMC states that the is envisioned to become the “<i>highest density node in the City</i>”, This is contradicted by Policy 4.2.2.5. (<i>That the subway extensions and enhanced VIVA service corridors and stations shall be the areas of highest development densities in the City</i>).</p> <p>2) Policy 1.6 and 1.7 (How to Read the Plan), if Plan is supposed to be read in its entirety, Volume 2 was only made available during the week of May 25, 2010.</p> <p>3) Policy 2.1.3.1. - Concerned that all OP policies and future amendments shall be consistent with the policies in the OP. The Policy as worded would limit any opportunity for amendments to address changing conditions.</p> <p>4) Policy 2.1.3.2. too many superlatives, not all new development in Vaughan will be able to achieve the standards, may be impractical or impossible to achieve.</p> <p>5) <i>Same as issue 4) above</i></p>	<p>1) Staff concur with the remark.</p> <p>2) Volume 2 consists of: five secondary plans which have been made available for review; and, secondary plans and area and site-specific amendments that are currently approved and in effect.</p> <p>3) When the plan is updated the policies will change. In the interim, all amendments will be considered in the context of the policies of this plan.</p> <p>4) Staff do not concur with this statement.</p> <p>5) See comment 4) above.</p> <p>6) The policy intent is elaborated upon in the subsequent paragraphs.</p> <p>7) The Policies set out in the new Official Plan restrict the amount of retail and office uses within Employment Areas. This is consistent with the policy objective of “employment land protection” of the</p>	<p>1) Policy 4.2.2.5. be revised to read: <i>“That the subway extensions and enhanced VIVA service corridors and stations shall be areas of high development densities in the City”.</i></p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) See response 116 (4) above.</p> <p>6) No change is recommended.</p> <p>7) No change recommended.</p> <p>8) Amend Figure 6 “Intensification Areas” to identify the boundaries of the centres identified.</p> <p>9) See recommendation for Item</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>6) Policy 2.2.3. what does definition of "state of art" mean?</p> <p>7) Policy 2.2.4.3. - Concerned that the Employment Area conversions to non-employment uses (retail) are too restrictive.</p> <p>8) Figure 6 "Intensification Areas" (page 37) - Boundaries are provided with no identification or description.</p> <p>9) The VMC is envisioned to become the "highest density node in the City". This is contradicted by Policy 4.2.2.5. (<i>That the subway extensions and enhanced VIVA service corridors and stations shall be the areas of highest development densities in the City</i>).</p> <p>10) A concern is raised that Section 3.2.1 includes a general comment regarding wetlands.</p> <p>11) A comment is made regarding Section 3.2.2 questioning the most detailed and up-to-date information available to delineate the Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>12) Section 3.2.3. There is a concern regarding the delineation of Enhancement Areas and a suggestion to delete the Enhancement Areas from the urban area.</p> <p>13) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.3.2</p>	<p>Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan.</p> <p>8) Staff concur with this statement.</p> <p>9) See comment (1) above.</p> <p>10) This section includes a general statement about ecosystem services provided by types of habitat.</p> <p>11) The comment is noted, but no change is necessary to the text.</p> <p>12) The respondent can review the background study, Natural Heritage in the City, for the basis of delineating the Enhancement Areas. Corridors and linkages are not necessarily only for wildlife movement, but also for population dispersal and linkages can be delineated for the appropriate ecological function. This issue was considered in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report under Item No. 19B.</p> <p>13) Using the term "in accordance with criteria provided by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the Province" is appropriate as these agencies have regulatory authority and</p>	<p>(1) above.</p> <p>10) No change is recommended.</p> <p>11) No change is recommended.</p> <p>12) See Recommendation for Item 19B) 4) of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>13) No change is recommended.</p> <p>14) Policy number sequence to be corrected.</p> <p>15) See Recommendation 13) above.</p> <p>16) Review and revise Volume 1 Official Plan to identify and italicize the term "adjacent" as it defined in Section 10.2.2. of the Official Plan. Where the term is not used in the context of Section 10.2.2., the term should not be italicized.</p> <p>17) No change is recommended.</p> <p>18) Policy 3.7.2.31 to be changes as follows: To work with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority to monitor the effects of</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>(incorrectly noted as 3.2.1.2 on Page 56 of the OP document) hands over control to the TRCA and the Province.</p> <p>14) Policy 3.2.3.9. was used twice (See page 58 and page 59).</p> <p>15) Policy 3.2.3.9 to Policy 3.2.3.11. A concern is raised about the area delineation and policies regarding Enhancement Areas.</p> <p>16) The term adjacent is a defined term. The defined term "adjacent" is not used consistently or properly throughout the OP. In a number of cases the defined term is used when common usage is intended.</p> <p>17) Policy 3.2.4.10 b). A concern is raised about the need for studies on "adjacent lands" within 120 metres of the Natural Heritage Network that may be outside of a Block Plan study area.</p> <p>18) A concern is raised that Policy 3.2.4.10 f) adds requirements for water quality and quantity beyond Ministry of Environment standards.</p> <p>19) Policy 3.2.4.11 - City application and processing fees are very substantial and more than adequate to cover the cost of peer review.</p> <p>20) A question is posed at what stage in the</p>	<p>provide guidance and criteria to interpret policy.</p> <p>14) Staff concur, revision to numbering sequence recommended.</p> <p>15) Policies regarding the Enhancement Areas are recommended to be modified to recognize the need for further environmental studies to determine the parts of Enhancement Areas to be designated as Core Features.</p> <p>16) The term "adjacent" should only be italicized where it is applicable as defined in the Official Plan.</p> <p>17) This issue can be addressed during the MESP process when determining the scope and Terms of Reference for the required studies.</p> <p>18) Policy 2.3.33 in the Region of York Official Plan places the responsibility on the Region, local municipalities and conservation authorities for addressing long-term cumulative impact of development. Policy 3.2.4.10 f) is recommended to be deleted and Policy 3.7.2.31 will be modified to include a note about collaboration among the City, Region and TRCA to address cumulative effects of downstream impacts. Refer to</p>	<p>new development and redevelopment in urban areas on receiving watercourses and the hydrologic balance in order to apply adaptive management measures as necessary to maintain water balance and evaluate flooding on downstream flood vulnerable areas.</p> <p>19) No change is recommended.</p> <p>20) No change is recommended.</p> <p>21) No change is recommended.</p> <p>22) No change is recommended.</p> <p>23) Policy 3.3.3.2 to be changed as follows: "That no application for development or site alteration on lands abutting or adjacent to woodlands will be considered unless: a. the precise limits of any woodland within the area of the application have been established to the satisfaction of the City."</p> <p>24) Policy 3.3.5.1 (b) to be changed as follows: "To protect aquatic biodiversity by: a. prohibiting development and site alteration in areas identified as fish</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>development process are the precise limits of valleylands delineated with respect to Policy 3.3.1.2.</p> <p>21) A concern is raised that Policy 3.3.1.5 would entrench “any and all policies of the MNR and TRCA”.</p> <p>22) There is a concern that policies in Section 3.3.2 protect all wetlands.</p> <p>23) There is a concern that Policy 3.3.3.2 a) would require the precise limits of a woodland to be defined on a separate property even if an application for development is on a different property.</p> <p>24) A concern is raised about maintaining pre-development infiltration rates as written in Policy 3.3.5.1 b).</p> <p>25) A point is raised that mass grading is more energy efficient and reduces greenhouse gases.</p> <p>26) Policy 3.7.2. Correct typo in 2nd last sentence in 1st paragraph.</p> <p>27) It is noted that Policy 3.7.2.6 erroneously refers to MNR standards.</p> <p>28) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.11 that pre-development infiltration rates</p>	<p>Comment 27 under Item 133B of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Meeting.</p> <p>19) The policy as written acts as an incentive to undertake comprehensive and integrated MESP studies so as to reduce the need for peer review.</p> <p>20) Policy 3.2.3.2 (incorrectly noted as 3.2.1.2 on Page 56 of the OP document) refers generally to the delineation of precise limits of mapped natural heritage features, and any additions to the mapped network, to be determined through appropriate study in accordance with criteria provided by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the Province. This may occur on a site-by-site basis through the development process or through studies carried out by the City, Region, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority or other government agencies.</p> <p>21) The language of the policy is to “support ongoing efforts” of these agencies.</p> <p>22) The intent of the policy is to protect any area evaluated as a wetland according to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System.</p>	<p>habitat; b. preserving or remediating natural variation in stream flows to maintain healthy aquatic systems ensuring any permitted development maintains pre-development water balance and groundwater direction.”</p> <p>25) No change is recommended.</p> <p>26) Policy 3.7.2. to be revised to read “to the extent”, second land sentence in first paragraph.</p> <p>27) Policy 3.7.2.6 be amended to delete reference to the MNR.</p> <p>28) No change is recommended.</p> <p>29) Refer to Recommendation 16) above.</p> <p>30) Policy 3.7.2.21 be amended to remove the reference to MNR.</p> <p>31) Policy 3.7.2.28 be changed as follows: “That all development will undertake stormwater management on a volume control basis that maintains recharge rates, flow paths and water quality to the extent possible, in addition to peak flow control, and to maintain pre-</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>cannot be maintained as a result of typical soils in Vaughan.</p> <p>29) The word “adjacent” in this context should not be the defined term, it should be the common usage.</p> <p>30) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.21 that MNR is not involved in preliminary or final design of stormwater facilities.</p> <p>31) A concern is raised regarding the difficulty of maintaining pre-development rates of infiltration as expressed in Policy 3.2.7.28.</p> <p>32) A concern is raised regarding Policy 3.7.2.29 and the note about stormwater ponds discharging directly to Core Features.</p> <p>33) Does the policy speak to “adjacent” as defined, or does it mean “next door” to a brownfeild site?</p> <p>34) Possible greenhouse gas reductions measures from farm operations are questioned as articulated in Policy 3.8.2.1 c).</p> <p>35) Policy 4.2.1.4. (City Engineering Standards), The current City standards are reflective of an auto oriented society.</p> <p>36) Policies 4.2.1.9. – Land securement through development process. 400 Series Highway</p>	<p>23) The intent of the adjacent lands is to ensure no negative impacts of development on the natural feature of interest. This can be evaluated even if the precise limits of the woodland on a separate property are not established. Accept the recommendation that the precise limits of the woodland within the area of the application needs to be established.</p> <p>24) Maintaining pre-to post water balance is a standard requirement of development applications. The policy can be revised to address water balance more generally rather than specifically to infiltration rates. However, watershed plans for the Don River and Humber River emphasize the need to maintain stream base flows as a key component of watershed health.</p> <p>25) It is the intent of Policy 3.5.1.2 c) to “minimize mass grading”. No specific metrics or standards are recommended by the proponent.</p> <p>26) Noted.</p> <p>27) It is agreed that, while the Province may provide standards and/or guidelines for interpretation in policies and by-laws, consultation with the MNR is not required.</p>	<p>development water balance. Particular emphasis will be placed on areas confirmed as significant recharge area.”</p> <p>32) Policy 3.7.2.29 be deleted.</p> <p>33) Refer to Recommendation 16) above.</p> <p>34) No change is recommended.</p> <p>35) No change is recommended.</p> <p>36) No change is recommended.</p> <p>37) See recommendation 36) above.</p> <p>38) See recommendation 36) above.</p> <p>39) See Recommendation 1) above.</p> <p>40) No change is recommended.</p> <p>41) No change is recommended.</p> <p>42) No change is recommended.</p> <p>43) Revise policy 4.4.1.5. to read: <i>“To protect rail infrastructure from</i></p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>intersections provide the City and or Regional benefits and the costs ought to be funded through City and/or Region wide development charges and/or general tax revenues.</p> <p>37) Policy 4.2.1.12. (same as 3b above).</p> <p>38) Policy 4.2.1.17. (same as 3b above).</p> <p>39) Policy 4.2.2.5. contradicts policies about densities of development in the VMC (related to Item No. 1 above).</p> <p>40) Policy 4.2.3.8. should consider reduced parking standards in zoning by-laws in exchange for bicycle parking or bicycle sharing.</p> <p>41) Policy 4.3.2.2. provide reduced parking standards to recognize provision of bicycle parking, bicycle sharing, car pooling, car sharing and zero emission vehicle.</p> <p>42) Policy 4.3.2.3. (Cash-in-lieu of Parking), this is counter productive to any reduction contemplated in Section 4.3.2.2.</p> <p>43) Policy 4.4.1.5. second sentence does not make sense.</p> <p>44) Policy 4.4.1.5.c, typo "proscribed"</p> <p>45) There are existing designated employment areas that this OP appears to eliminate. This</p>	<p>Reference to MNR in Policy 3.7.2.6 should be deleted.</p> <p>28) This policy refers to "significant groundwater infiltration functions" and is also consistent with Policy 2.3.5 of the Region of York Official Plan.</p> <p>29) Refer to comment 16 above.</p> <p>30) Staff concurs with this comment.</p> <p>31) It is recommended to change the text of Policy 3.7.2.28 to maintain water balance consistent with Policy 2.3.2 of the Region of York OP.</p> <p>32) Policy 3.7.2.29 will be deleted as aspects of the policy are covered elsewhere.</p> <p>33) Refer to comment 16) above.</p> <p>34) The example of energy from waste operations, such as biofuels from agricultural waste, presents legitimate concerns of air emissions and minimum separation distances. These will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>35) Policies are included throughout the Plan to facilitate creation of streets that are pedestrian friendly with an enhanced</p>	<p><i>encroaching adjacent development that may impede operations due to noise or environmental concerns. Specifically, development adjacent to a railway right-of-way shall provide:..."</i></p> <p>44) Revise type in policy 4.4.1.5.c) to read "<i>prescribed</i>".</p> <p>45) No change is recommended.</p> <p>46) No change is recommended.</p> <p>47) See recommendation 16) above.</p> <p>48) Revise typo in Policy 6.4.1.5. to read "<i>developable</i>".</p> <p>49) Revise policy 7.1.1.3. to read: "<i>To support and encourage the provision of a full range of housing options across the City to meet the current and future needs of all residents. Vaughan shall plan for a balanced supply of housing that includes diversity in housing type, tenure, and affordability</i>".</p> <p>50) No change is recommended.</p> <p>51) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>policy would appear to make significant tracts of existing development in Vaughan non-conforming.</p> <p>46) The restriction of the size of office space in Employment Areas. The Plan fails to recognize the realities of corporate decision making, where corporate head office locations are chosen outside of these areas for reasons related entirely to the corporate image, needs and aspirations of the proposed user.</p> <p>47) Policy 6.1.1.1., 6.2.3.2., 6.2.4. and 6.3.2.4. the use of the word "adjacent" doesn't appear to mean 'adjacent' as defined.</p> <p>48) Policy 6.4.1.5. typo "evelopable."</p> <p>49) Policy 7.1.1.3. Vaughan can promote a balanced supply but it cannot ensure that a balanced supply of housing is provided. Vaughan cannot ensure that a balanced supply of housing is provided.</p> <p>50) Policy 7.3.1.2. (e) no parkland credit for linear parks with a minimum of 25m width.</p> <p>51) Policy 7.3.3. and 7.3.3.7. some parkland is to be acquired outside the provisions of the Planning Act. All parkland must be acquired through the provisions of the Planning Act.</p> <p>52) Request revision to Policy 7.3.3.4</p>	<p>public realm.</p> <p>36) This matter can be reviewed when the Development Charges review is undertaken.</p> <p>37) See comment 36) above.</p> <p>38) See comment 36) above.</p> <p>39) See comment 1) above.</p> <p>40) City wide parking standards are being reviewed to implement the policies of the Official Plan. Comments respecting parking standards can be facilitated through this review.</p> <p>41) See comment 40) above.</p> <p>42) See comment 40) above.</p> <p>43) Staff concur. A Revision to the sentence is required.</p> <p>44) Noted.</p> <p>45) It is not the intent of the City to maintain all existing official plan policies. Only those policies in Volume 2 will be maintained because they are recent amendments, reflect O.M.B. decisions or are consistent with the new Official Plan.</p>	<p>52) No change is recommended.</p> <p>53) No change is recommended.</p> <p>54) No change is recommended.</p> <p>55) Policy 9.1.1.9e) be amended as follows: "establish a public art contribution from private development."</p> <p>56) No change is recommended.</p> <p>57) No change is recommended.</p> <p>58) No change is recommended.</p> <p>59) Policy 9.2.2.9 (d) and 9.2.2.10 (e) will be modified as follows: "Separation distance guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Environment, or alternative measures shall be applied to achieve compatibility between uses in the General Employment designation and adjacent sensitive land uses."</p> <p>60) A modification to Policy 9.2.2.13b) is recommended to read:</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>respecting calculation of Parkland Dedication, as it bears no correlation to the actual needs of the community residents for parkland or to any test of fairness or reasonableness.</p> <p>53) Policy 7.5.1.3 - Request section be removed as Vaughan cannot require all builders/developers to provide rental and special needs housing.</p> <p>54) Policy 8.4.3.2. Road crossings of TransCanada Pipeline are normally permitted.</p> <p>55) Policy 9.1.1.9e) - Request section be deleted as public art contribution associated with private development is unreasonable and not appropriate in OP policy.</p> <p>56) Policy 9.2.1.5 and 9.2.1.6 - Request FSI figures be reviewed as OPA 600 there are areas currently designated Medium Density Residential/Commercial which are zoned to permit on street townhouses. Based upon typical standards street townhouses could have an FSI significantly greater than 1.5 FSI proposed in the new OP</p> <p>57) Policy 9.2.2.1 and 9.2.2.2 and 9.2.2.5 and 9.2.2.6 - Request clarification as built form policies are unclear. Do townhouse types include block townhouses as opposed to only street related townhouses.</p>	<p>46) The urban structure has been reviewed, which contemplates limited office use in Employment areas. These office uses are more appropriately located in the VMC and on Intensification Corridors. The proposed policies will protect the City's Employment lands from non-employment uses.</p> <p>47) Refer to comment 16 above.</p> <p>48) Noted.</p> <p>49) Staff concur with this statement.</p> <p>50) Linear greenways are intended to provide links and connections in the plan. They do not function as parks.</p> <p>51) A number of municipalities in the GTA utilize similar Parkland dedication rates as the City of Vaughan. The Official outlines parkland dedication requirements for residential and non-residential development in Sections 7.3.3.2 and 7.3.3.3.</p> <p>As the City's parkland dedication rates are consistent with the Planning Act, no changes to the policies are contemplated</p> <p>52) See Item No. 51 above.</p>	<p>"New Community Areas are subject to one comprehensive and co-ordinated Secondary Plan process unless extenuating circumstances (eg. GTA West Corridor) would dictate otherwise, that will achieve, among other things, the following:".</p> <p>61) This policy should be modified to express that the Secondary Plan/Block Plan shall include phasing policies to ensure the orderly development of servicing and construction. The policy be amended to remove reference to 75%.</p> <p>62) No change recommended.</p> <p>63) No change is recommended.</p> <p>64) No change is recommended.</p> <p>65) No change is recommended.</p> <p>66) Refer to Recommendation for 57) above.</p> <p>67) No change is recommended.</p> <p>68) No change is recommended.</p> <p>69) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>58) Raised concern respecting Policy 9.9.2.9. that existing permissions in place in existing employment areas appear to be eliminated. This would appear to make significant tracts of existing development in Vaughan non-conforming. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>59) Policy 9.2.2.9.d & 9.2.2.10.e (Separation distance). Policies required compatibility between the General and Prestige Employment designations and uses in other land use designations. MOE Distance Separation Guideline deal only with the separation between employment uses and sensitive uses.</p> <p>60) Policy 9.2.2.13 (b) - Clarification is requested if the intent of the policy is to include both New Community Areas in one Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>61) Policy 9.2.2.13(b)(xiii) and (xiv) - Requires 75% of phase to be built or under construction before subsequent phases may be registered. This could be onerous and adversely affect timing of development.</p> <p>62) Policy 9.2.2.13 d that " development applications will not be considered"</p> <p>63) Policy 9.2.2.13(d)ii. It is recommended that the sub-watershed study be allowed to be completed by the proponent rather than undertaken by TRCA in coordination with the</p>	<p>53) The policy is consistent with Provincial and Regional policy objectives.</p> <p>54) This is noted. The policy speaks to "structures" and provides flexibility subject to Trans Canada's satisfaction.</p> <p>55) Policy 9.1.1.9 speaks to establishing a Public Art program that "will" (rather than "shall") among other things, establish public art contributions from private development.</p> <p>56) The Official Plan does not propose to change existing zoning permissions. In the event that the FSI of 1.5 is proven to be unrealistic, staff will revisit this.</p> <p>57) Section 9.2.3.2 identifies the policies that apply to all townhouse units.</p> <p>58) Refer to comment 45) above.</p> <p>59) Appendix C of the D-6-3 Separation Distances manual refers only to distances between Class I, II and III industrial uses and "Sensitive Land Uses". Accordingly, it is appropriate to modify Policy 9.2.2.9 (d) and 9.2.2.10 (e) to reflect that distance separation between employment uses and "Sensitive Land Uses".</p>	<p>70) No change is recommended.</p> <p>71) That Policy 9.2.3.5 be added to modify the second sentence. "Primary windows on a facade shall achieve a minimum windows separation from other primary windows facades of 30 metres".</p> <p>72) No change is recommended.</p> <p>73) No change is recommended,</p> <p>74) Policy 9.2.3.4. d) should be revised to read: "<i>The rooftop of Low-Rise Buildings should include landscaped green space, private outdoor amenity space or environmental features such as solar panels and cool roofs</i>".</p> <p>75) Staff and consultants should review Policies 9.2.3.5 and 9.2.3.6 to address the appropriate facing distances between primary window building elevations and the appropriate side yard setbacks from lower building forms to mid and high-rise buildings and bring forward revised policies.</p> <p>76) See Recommendation 75)</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>City.</p> <p>64) The respondent is concerned that Policy 9.2.2.13.diii prevents the concurrent preparation of a Secondary Plan and Block Plan.</p> <p>65) Policy 9.2.3. (Building Types and Development Criteria), the entire section reads too much like a zoning by-law. The level of detail is inappropriate for an OP.</p> <p>66) Policy 9.2.3.2.e - This section seems to imply only street townhouses, and excludes block townhouses.</p> <p>67) Policy 9.2.3.2.e. - 18m separation is far excess of the zoning standard in the by-law today.</p> <p>68) Policy 9.2.3.3.b. should permit 4 to 5 storeys. Revise policy to be consistent with Low Rise Residential to permit 5 storeys.</p> <p>69) Policy 9.2.3.3.b: 50m is an arbitrary number.</p> <p>70) Policy 9.2.3.3.d - Requests revisions as stacked townhouses are typically part of a block form development, with few of the units fronting onto public street.</p> <p>71) Policy 9.2.3.3e) - Why does the facing distance have to be greater than that of mid-rise</p>	<p>60) It is the intent that the New Community Areas identified for Block 27 and 41 will require one Secondary Plan.</p> <p>61) Regarding Section 9.2.2.13 (b) (xiii) and (xiv) Section 9.2.2.13 (b) (xiii) and (xiv) included in the Official Plan requires that the 75% of a Phase of development be either built or under construction before a subsequent phase could be registered. This policy could be problematic considering that there can be a number of different conditions which determine whether it is appropriate to proceed to the subsequent phase of development, and not necessarily the specific degree of completion of the preceding phase.</p> <p>62) The City requires appropriate due diligence is completed, in order for staff to review comprehensively.</p> <p>63) TRCA has consistently raised concerns that the Humber River Watershed Plan concluded that development in the watershed beyond areas designated for urban development in approved municipal official plans (pre 2005) could significantly increase downstream flood flows and flood risk. As a result, an updated hydrologic study is required to properly plan for new</p>	<p>above.</p> <p>77) No change is recommended.</p> <p>78) See Recommendation for Item No. 74) above.</p> <p>79) See Recommendation for Item No. 45) above.</p> <p>80) See Recommendation for Item No. 116 (3) of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>81) The policy should be modified to reflect "prior to final approval".</p> <p>82) See Recommendation for Item No. 111e) above.</p> <p>83) No change is recommended.</p> <p>84) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>building which is 15m?</p> <p>72) Policy 9.2.3.4.b) - Needs to recognize that singles, semi's and townhouses are Low Rise buildings which could abut on the rear or side of other singles, semi's or towns without having to address the angular plane.</p> <p>73) Policy 9.2.3.4.c - The way the section is worded surface parking on a driveway in front of a single, semi or townhouse is not permitted.</p> <p>74) Policy 9.2.3.4.d) - All singles, semis and towns must have one or more of these components. This is not feasible or practical.</p> <p>75) Policy 9.2.3.5.c) - Mid-rise buildings abutting side yard of singles, semis or townhouses should be subject to similar requirements?</p> <p>76) Policy 9.2.3.6.c) - High-rise buildings abutting side yard of singles, semis or townhouses should be subject to similar requirements?</p> <p>77) Policy 9.2.3.7.d) respecting building and parking area orientation. What does this provision achieve in an employment area?</p> <p>78) Policy 9.2.3.7.f) respecting "rooftops" of Employment and Industrial Buildings, mandatory provisions not acceptable.</p>	<p>development. TRCA, in a July 29, 2010 letter to the Region of York, copied to the City of Vaughan, confirms the need for a watershed-scale study to determine the hydrologic impact of development beyond the current urban boundaries for the Humber River and Rouge River watersheds. TRCA is best suited to address the spatial scale and content of the study.</p> <p>64) This policy does not prevent the concurrent preparation of Secondary and Block Plans. The intent of the policy is to ensure that Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications are not considered by Council until the required Secondary and Block Plans are completed and all conditions satisfied.</p> <p>65) The plan includes policies to guide built form. Section 9.2.1.2 also provides flexibility to facilitate minor variations to the policies.</p> <p>66) Refer to recommendation 57) above.</p> <p>67) The city's current zoning by-law does not include a standard respecting minimum facing separation distance. The policy is considered appropriate and Section 9.2.1.2 provides flexibility to facilitate minor variations to the policy.</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>79) Provision needs to be made in this section for the readoption or incorporation of all Council adopted and approved Secondary Plans within the existing designated urban areas in the City of Vaughan. The Plan as currently structured in Volume 2 does not achieve this and provides no basis for the ongoing application of these Secondary Plans. As indicated previously, this is a very serious issue that needs to be properly addressed.</p> <p>80) Policy 10.1.1.5 to 10.1.1.15 Block Plans - Request policies similar to 10.2.ix,a),b),c), of OPA 600 be incorporated for block plan approvals.</p> <p>81) Raised concern respecting Policy 10.1.2.28. "... the owner seeking to subdivide land may be required to satisfy certain conditions prior to approval of a Plan of Subdivision..." These conditions are typically draft conditions of draft plan approval required to be satisfied prior to registration.</p> <p>82) Policy 10.1.2.28.e) requires the conveyance of school sites at a price established at the day before the draft plan approval under Section 51 (25.1), however this section of the Act has not been proclaimed and is therefore not in effect.</p> <p>83) Policy 10.1.2.29 - Concern that conditions of Block Plan approval shall be satisfied prior to</p>	<p>68) Policy applies to "Low Rise Buildings" as defined in the OP.</p> <p>69) The Official plan includes a policy (Section 9.2.1.2) which permits flexibility in the numerical values (except building height and FSI) to facilitate flexibility in building design requested subject to an Urban Design Brief being submitted to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>70) Staff maintain policy in Official Plan. It is noted that policy states that 'stacked townhouse' should "generally"....</p> <p>71) The proponents point is noted and a change to Mid-Rise Buildings Policy 9.2.3.5 d) is recommended to increase the separation between primary window facades. See Recommendation 75).</p> <p>72) This section relates to "Low-Rise" buildings as defined by Section 9.2.3.4. and would not prevent single's/semi's backing on to each other.</p> <p>73) Singles and semi's are separately defined building types in the OP, therefore Policy 9.2.3.4. (c) does not apply.</p> <p>74) Policy wording should be changed</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>draft plan approval.</p> <p>84) Policy 10.1.3.5. Cost of peer review to be at expense of the applicant. City application and processing fees are very substantial and more than adequate to cover the cost of peer review.</p>	<p>from "shall" to "should".</p> <p>75) The proponent's point is noted.</p> <p>76) See Comment 75) above.</p> <p>77) This policy is consistent with Policy 5.2. in the Regional Official Plan, where building orientation and parking areas applies to all land uses. The policy would help to achieve a portion of the building directly related to the street uninterrupted by surface parking so as to create a more pedestrian and transit supportive environment.</p> <p>78) See comment for 74) above.</p> <p>79) See comment 45) above</p> <p>80) See comments and Recommendations for Item No. 116 (3) of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>81) These types of conditions are typical of draft plan approval required to be satisfied prior to final approval.</p> <p>82) See comment for Item No. 111e).</p> <p>83) The process does allow flexibility in that subdivision applications can be</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>reviewed and processed while the Block Plan is being finalized. The intent of the policy is to prevent Block Plan conditions from being satisfied through the subdivision process, which is not appropriate.</p> <p>84) The policy as written acts as an incentive to undertake comprehensive and integrated studies so as to reduce the need for peer review.</p>	
<p>134B</p>	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Embee Properties Limited</p> <p>FOR: Embee Properties Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 9771 - 9799 Jane Street & 9930 - 9980 Dufferin Street</p>	<p>Follow up to respondents letter of June 7, 2010 (Item No. 134 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report).</p>	<p>On August 4, 2010, the respondent forwarded an e-mail to the City clarifying that if drive-through facilities are permitted on Jane Street and Major Mackenzie Drive, then the letter of July 26, 2010, can be read to seek this confirmation. Recommended changes to the drive-through policies identified in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Staff Report would permit drive-through facilities on Local Intensification Corridors such as Jane Street and Major Mackenzie Drive.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
<p>135B</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p>	<p>The proponent has concern that aggregate designations and aggregate policies have been ignored.</p>	<p>Need to be consistent with the Region of York Official Plan. Subject lands are in the Rural Area designation (Map 8 of Region OP). Map 1 (Structure) depicts</p>	<p>Map change is recommended on Schedules 1,13 and 13J to show as "Ministers Decision on ORMCP Designation Deferred".</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>RESPONDENT: Cam Milani</p> <p>FOR: Rizmi Holdings Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: East side of Dufferin Street, north of Teston Road (West half Lot 30 Con. 2)</p>		<p>lands are Natural Core and Natural Linkage of the ORMCP. It is also recognized as "Ministers Decision on ORMCP Designation Deferred".</p>	
<p>142B</p>	<p>DATE: July 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Evans Planning</p> <p>FOR: Vogue Investments Limited and Centre Street Properties Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1118 and 1136 Centre Street</p>	<p>Supports the "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" policies in draft OP (Volume 1), and requests that the subordination policies in Policy 12.2.10 of Volume 2 be reconsidered.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed previously in the response to Item No. 142 of Special Committee of the Whole Report of the July 28, 2010. At this time, the Volume 2 policies are proposed to be applied to the lands. These policies implement study findings that were subject to an extensive consultation process. Any changes to the land uses on these lands should only be considered through a future study of OPA 672.</p>	<p>Volume 2 policies of the Centre Street OPA 672 should apply to these lands for the purposes of this planning process. A further study of the OPA 672 area should be undertaken in the future. No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
142C	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: The Vogue Development Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Vogue Investments Limited; Centre Street Properties Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 1118 and 1136 Centre Street</p>	<p>Concern respecting the subordination policies in Policy 12.2.10 of Volume 2 where there is a conflict in land use, then the existing OPA 672 policies would apply, which would result in no residential uses and no intensification on the lands.</p> <p>The City should be willing to assess studies undertaken by area owners that on a comprehensive basis review the opportunities for mixed-use developments in specific areas; and this should be expressed as a policy in the Official Plan that is consistent with the Volume 1 policies promoting intensification.</p>	See Comment in Item No. 142B above.	No change is recommended.
142D	<p>DATE: July 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Evans Planning</p> <p>FOR: Vogue Investments Limited; Centre Street Properties Inc.</p>	Supports the Mid-Rise Mixed-Use policies proposed for the Centre Street Area as contained in Volume 1 and suggests that the override policies shown in the Note to section 12.1.10 be deleted.	See Comments in Item No. 142B above.	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: 1118 and 1136 Centre Street</p>			
<p>144B</p>	<p>DATE: May 17, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: 1559586 Ontario Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 10056 and 10068 Keele Street</p>	<p>Supports the inclusion of the lands in the intensification area and the proposed Low-Rise Mixed-Use designation. However, it is suggested that the property warrants higher density permissions given that it is designated a Local Centre and is also designated as a Primary Intensification Corridor. They believe that a density of 1.5 FSI is appropriate for the site.</p>	<p>The subject lands are located within the Maple Heritage Conservation District. The proposed densities and heights in the Official Plan are considered appropriate and are consistent with the remainder of the Village Core in this area.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
<p>144C</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: 1559586 Ontario Inc.</p>	<p>This letter refers to their submission of May 17, 2010 (Item No. 144B above) regarding 1559586 Ontario Inc. The respondent wants to verify that the letter was received and if there was a staff response for to their submission.</p>	<p>See comment in Item No. 144B, above.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: 10056 and 10068 Keele Street</p>			
<p>154B</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Cam Milani</p> <p>FOR: 611428 Ontario Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Milani Blvd.</p>	<p>1) This is a follow up letter to Item No. 154 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report. The respondent has requested that the lands located west of the valley (currently zoned A Agricultural Zone) be designated for industrial uses with no environmental features or need for TRCA fill approval.</p> <p>2) Correction to July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report Item 154 -1)</p>	<p>1) The lands total land holdings are located between Highway 27 and the valley are subject to Registered Plan of Subdivision 65M-3966. The lands are zoned C2 (hydro corridor to Hwy # 27), EM1, EM1(H), EM2(H) and EM3 (valley land to hydro corridor) and A Agricultural Zone (west of valley land) by to site-specific Exception 9(1253).</p> <p>The lands west of the valley are currently identified as Deferral Area #5 in OPA No. 450, are zoned A Agricultural Zone and are located within the Highway 427 Transportation Corridor EA Route Alternatives. The lands are also subject to TRCA approvals. The subject lands are designated Infrastructure and Utilities in the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>The subject lands located generally south of Langstaff Road and west of Regional Road 27 appear to include part of a defined valley corridor as well as Regionally Significant woodlands. To the</p>	<p>1) That Schedule 1 be amended to show the lands within the regulated area as Natural Areas and Countryside and the lands outside of the regulated area as Employment Areas. That Schedule 2 be amended to show the lands within the regulated area as Core Features. That Schedule 13 and 13-P be amended to show the lands within the regulated area as Natural Areas and the lands outside of the regulated area as "Prestige Employment" and "General Employment".</p> <p>2) That Recommendation 1 for Item 154 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report be deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>That Schedule 13 be amended to designate the lands located between the valley lands and the</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>west of the defined valley corridor and stream channel is a drainage feature included in the TRCA generic regulation limit. These lands were the subject of a decision of the Ontario Court of Justice (Divisional Court - Toronto), March 6 and 7, 1996, File No. 123/94. The Court decision essentially supports the protection of the valley feature and tributary. The Court decision supports the inclusion of lands within the regulated area as Core Features.</p> <p>2) In the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report, respecting the recommendation to Item No. 154-1) it was recommended that Schedule 13-P be amended to designate lands between Highway 27 and the valley as "General Employment." This recommendation should have stated lands from the valley to the Hydro Corridor should be designated "General Employment."</p> <p>It is noted that under Item No. 61 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report that the lands from the Hydro corridor to Highway 27 are recommended to be designated as "Commercial Mixed Use".</p>	<p>hydro corridor as "General Employment" to recognize the existing zoning and approved draft plan of subdivision.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
164B	<p>DATE: June 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Humphries Planning Group</p> <p>FOR: 77 Woodstream Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: 77 Woodstream Boulevard</p>	<p>Request that the subject site be designated Mid-Rise Mixed-Use. This is the same request considered under Item No. 164A of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>	<p>See comments and recommendation for Item No. 164A of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
171B	<p>DATE: July 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Rita Salini</p> <p>FOR: Lega Holdings Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northeast corner of Highway 50 and Langstaff Road</p>	<p>Request that the OP protect the current zoning approval on the subject lands. This is the same request considered under Item No. 171 of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>	<p>See comments and recommendations for Item No. 171 of Special Committee of the Whole Meeting of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
172B	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Vaughanwood Ratepayers Association</p> <p>LOCATION: Land along the Highway 7 corridor in proximity to Wigwoss Drive</p>	<p>This request was considered as Item No. 172 at the Special Committee of the Whole meeting of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>On July 28, 2010, the Committee of the Whole adopted the following resolution with respect to the subject lands:</p> <p>“Be it resolved that the Schedule 13Q be amended to permit a maximum building height of 6 stories and an FSI of 2.0;”</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-Q be amended to permit a maximum building height of 6 stories and FSI of 2.0, in accordance with the Committee of the Whole resolution of July 28, 2010.</p>
197	<p>DATE: July 16, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: G. Ahmadi</p> <p>LOCATION: 2057 Major Mackenzie Drive</p>	<p>This letter was originally considered in the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report as Item No. 197. A request is made to increase the proposed density and building height on the property.</p>	<p>The property should be designated for higher order residential land use under the condition of protecting of the existing heritage structure and landscaping.</p> <p>The lands are approximately 0.72 hectares in size and located on the south side of Major Mackenzie Drive, east of City Hall, on the east side of CP Rail line, in the community of Maple. The lands are located within a rapid transit corridor in the York Region Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan and is in proximity to the Maple GO station. The Region's general policies for areas located on rapid transit corridors is to increase overall density to achieve transit and pedestrian oriented urban</p>	<p>That Schedule 13-O be amended to redesignate the lands from Low-Rise-Residential to Mid-Rise Residential with a maximum building height of 4 storeys and FSI of 1.5.</p> <p>2) That a site specific exception be included in Volume 2, respecting these lands including the following policies.</p> <p>“The following policies shall apply to the lands identified as 2057 Major Mackenzie Drive:</p> <p>a. the existing heritage building shall be maintained, protected,</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	
			<p>environment. The site is currently designated "Medium Density-Residential Commercial" by OPA 600, and has been designated Low-Rise Residential by the new Official Plan.</p> <p>The lands contain an existing heritage building, listed in the City of Vaughan's "<i>Listing of Buildings of Architectural and Historical Value</i>". The City's policies for listed heritage buildings are intended to protect and preserve significant existing heritage features. The addition of site specific policies will achieve the long term protection and use of the heritage building.</p> <p>The lands should be designated "Mid-Rise Residential" with the appropriate development standards and policies to protect the existing heritage structure and vegetation and provide for development that is compatible with the surrounding land use context. A site specific exemption can be included in Volume 2.</p>	<p>preserved, and appropriately integrated with the new development on the property in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. existing vegetation should be preserved to the greatest extent possible through the site plan review process; c. all required tenant parking spaces shall be located underground and limited visitor parking may be permitted above grade, subject to site plan approval; d. the overall development of the lands shall be subject to a comprehensive site plan approved by Council, together with the submission of the following reports to be approved through consideration of a site plan application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. heritage building preservation plan and architectural design brief guidelines; ii. existing vegetation assessment and tree

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>preservation plan; iii. landscape master plan; iv. shadow study; v. noise study; vi. traffic impact study; and, vii. any other reports considered appropriate by the City as set out in Section 10.1.3 of the Official Plan.</p>
<p>240</p>	<p>DATE: July 02, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Glen Shields Soccer Club, Filipino Canadian Association of Vaughan</p> <p>LOCATION: Patricia Kemp Community Centre</p>	<p>1) Schedule 9- New Interchanges- proposed transit corridor to be built in this area. GSSC and FCVA oppose a transit corridor as the Patricia Kemp Community Centre is located there. There is no space for transit corridor. Transit corridor should be located further north close to Hwy. 407.</p> <p>2) Schedule 14- Required Secondary Plan Areas, Dufferin Street and Centre Street, GSSC and FCAV have been tenants of Patricia Kemp Community Centre since 2002. This facility serves various associations and the neighbourhood, and the benefits the community centre offers to the community cannot be measured by money. Therefore they are opposed to any plans that will demolish it.</p>	<p>1) Schedule 10 of the draft City of Vaughan Official Plan identifies Dufferin Street at this location as a “Special Study Corridor” which is consistent with the Region of York Official Plan.</p> <p>2) The Official Plan does not propose the demolition of buildings.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
241	<p>DATE: July 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Norstar Building Corporation</p> <p>LOCATION: 1176 Rutherford Road</p>	<p>1) Requests that subject lands be redesignated from "Mixed Use 1- Exception "6" to "High Density Residential" (OPA 651) to permit a maximum FSI of 3.5.</p> <p>2) The Draft Carville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study (CDCUDSMPS) recommends a maximum floor plate of 805 m2. Although they agree that point towers on a podium are superior to long slab buildings from an architectural perspective flexibility is requested with respect to the maximum tower floor plate size, which should be determined through the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>3) The CDCUDSMPS proposes a maximum building height of 24 storeys for the subject lands. Based on the implementation of an FSI of 3.5 and a floor plate of 805m2 and a three storey podium, a 25 storey height will be required.</p> <p>Would like Volume 2 to be revised on a site specific basis to accommodate the comments noted above.</p>	<p>1) Council on June 29, 2010, approved the Carville District Centre Urban Design Streetscape Master Plan Study, which provides for a maximum FSI of 2.84 on the subject lands. No further density increase is contemplated at this time.</p> <p>2) Policy 9.1.2.1 provides for minor modifications to the built form policies provided they are supported by an Urban Design Brief to the satisfaction of the City.</p> <p>3) Policies 9.2.1.5, 9.2.1.6, and 9.2.1.8 addresses the relationship between and application of building height and FSI. If a maximum FSI is achieved it cannot be used to justify additional building height. Also, in light of Comment 1) above, the additional building height is not supported.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>
248B	<p>DATE: August 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP</p>	<p>This letter was submitted in response to Item No. 248 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010. Their client's concerns with respect to earlier correspondence of June 7, 2010, have not been addressed to their satisfaction. They urge that these concerns be</p>	<p>Staff has further reviewed the issues raised by the respondent and no change to the comments and recommendations for Item No. 248 of the Special Committee of the Whole report of July 28, 2010 are proposed.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: Calloway REIT (400 and 7) Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest quadrant of Highway 7 and Highway 400</p>	<p>addressed prior to any further consideration of the Draft OP.</p>		
<p>248C</p>	<p>DATE: August 05, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP</p> <p>FOR: Calloway REIT (400 and 7) Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Northwest quadrant of Highway 7 and Highway 400</p>	<p>1) See Issue under Item No. 248B above.</p>	<p>1) See comment under Item No. 248B, above.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p>
<p>263</p>	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p>	<p>The respondent requests that the subject lands be designated "Commercial Mixed Use".</p>	<p>The lands are located within the area identified as the Vaughan Corporate Centre (under OPA 500) on the east side of Chrislea Road, north of Portage Parkway, abutting Highway 400. The lands are designated "Corporate Centre District" in OPA 663.</p>	<p>That Schedule 13 and 13-R be amended to designate the subject lands "Commercial Mixed-Use".</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: 1350150 Ontario Ltd.</p> <p>LOCATION: Lot 25, Chrislea Road</p>		<p>The subject lands are proposed to be designated "Prestige Employment" on Land Use Schedule 13-R of the Draft Official Plan Volume 1, which does not permit the range of retail uses currently permitted by OPA 500. Furthermore, the "Prestige Employment" designation is considered an "Employment Area" where major retail uses are not permitted.</p> <p>The "Prestige Employment" designation assigned on Land Use Schedule 13-R is an oversight as these lands are identified on Schedule 1 as a "Primary Centre" within an Intensification Area. Schedule 14 includes the site within the Weston Road and Highway 7 required Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>Staff concurs and recommends that Schedules 13 and 13-R be amended.</p>	
<p>264</p>	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: History Hill Group</p> <p>FOR:</p> <p>LOCATION: Several Locations</p>	<p>1) Concerned that the reduction of the permitted uses in Employment Areas will have a negative impact on development in the future and affect their current holdings.</p> <p>2) Concerned with the inclusion of urban design guidelines in an Official Plan. Urban design guidelines may vary from time to time and entrenching these guidelines in the Official Plan may limit their flexibility and</p>	<p>1) The policies in the Official Plan restrict the amount of retail and office uses within Employment Areas. This policy framework is consistent with the policy objective of "employment land protection" of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the York Region Official Plan.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	throughout Vaughan	opportunity to be applied on a neighbourhood level or case specific development.	2) Built form flexibility is provided in section 9.2.1.2. Minor variations from the policies of section 9.2.3 do not require an amendment to the Official Plan provided that they are supported through an Urban Design Brief approved to the satisfaction of the City.	
270	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Davies Howe Partners</p> <p>FOR: Trinistar Corporation</p> <p>LOCATION: Various properties throughout Vaughan</p>	Counsel for Trinistar Corporation is not satisfied with the staff response provided for the MAM Group Inc. letter (Item No. 152 on the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010) as noted below. They indicate that they had requested to meet with Staff and the City's consultant to discuss their concerns. Until this meeting occurs their clients suggest that the approval of the Draft OP must be deferred.	Staff has further considered the request and no change in the comment provided for Item 152 of the Special Committee of the Whole report of July 28, 2010.	No change is recommended.
271	<p>DATE: July 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: KLM Planning Partners Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: City-Wide</p>	Concern is raised regarding the issues raised in their letter of June 28, 2010, which should have been addressed without providing the names of their clients and location of properties. It is requested that the issues raised be addressed.	?	No change is recommended.

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
275	<p>DATE: July 16, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>FOR: Royal Group Inc.</p>	<p>Letter requesting that the City Clerk notify the respondent of the adoption of City of Vaughan Official Plan.</p>	<p>The City Clerks Department will notify all individuals/companies with letters on record.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>
277	<p>DATE: July 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Paul Ekstein</p> <p>LOCATION: 10090 Huntington Road</p>	<p>The letter notes that while urban development of the property is not to be anticipated to occur in the next planning period (2011 to 2031) in the new Region of York Official Plan the lands are identified as being "Strategic Employment Lands".</p> <p>Request that the City's Official Plan incorporate appropriate implementing provisions safeguarding the future (post 2031) strategic employment areas as identified by the Region's Official Plan.</p>	<p>The lands are recognized in the Region's Plan as "Strategic Employment Lands", which is considered sufficient to safeguard the lands as a future employment area.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
280	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Major Mackenzie Property Limited</p>	<p>1) The City's proposed policies do not reflect the purpose of drive-through facilities nor recognize their essential value as established land uses. The City fails to establish a suitable basis for their recommendations.</p> <p>2) There is no evidence to demonstrate that a drive-through can not be a legitimate</p>	<p>1) & 2) The issue regarding drive through facilities was reviewed in the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report and modifications were proposed. Staff have reviewed the applicant's request and no further changes are recommended.</p>	<p>1) & 2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: Major Mackenzie Property Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: 9801-9855 Jane St & 2933-2963 Major Mackenzie Dr.</p>	<p>component of mixed-use corridors. It is their submission that the City acknowledges existing and new drive-through facilities as acceptable and permitted uses along Primary Intensification Corridors.</p>		
<p>282</p>	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Aird and Berlis LLP</p> <p>FOR: York Region Standard Condominium Corporation 1053</p> <p>LOCATION: 50 and 60 Disera Drive (YRSCC Property)</p>	<p>York Region Condominium Corporation 1053 (YRSCC 1053) is located adjacent to lands which are the subject of OPA 710 and Zoning By-law 134-2010, which has been appealed to the OMB. The subject lands are designated Low-Rise Mixed-Use and High-Rise Mixed-Use in the draft Vaughan Official Plan. YRSCC 1053 has concerns with the adverse impacts that the proposed draft Vaughan Official Plan designations will have on the surrounding area. It contends that intensification must be balanced with the existing scale, height, building type, character, form and planned function of the immediate surrounding local area.</p> <p>OPA 710 is the subject of an appeal, the future official plan designation on the subject property is premature until the appeal is resolved.</p>	<p>The Official Plan includes policies (Section: 9.1.2.1) to facilitate an appropriate transition between existing development and potential intensification. The appeal of OPA 710 and By-law 134-2010 will be considered on their own merit based on the policies in place at the time the development applications were considered. The Official Plan can be amended to reflect any decision made by the OMB.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
287	<p>DATE: July 26, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Gowlings</p> <p>FOR: A&W Foods Services of Canada McDonald's Restaurants of Canada TDL Group Corp. Wendy's Restaurant of Canada Inc. Ontario Restaurant Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA)</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Concern that the new Official Plan and associated documents seek to prohibit drive-through facilities as a use in Vaughan. They urge Committee and Council to refrain from passing those portions of the Official Plan that seeks to prohibit drive-through facilities.</p> <p>Furthermore, they strongly suggest that any and all existing prohibitions that exist in existing Secondary Plans, site and area specific policies, which are proposed to be amended as part of Volume 2 of the proposed new Official Plan be removed.</p> <p>They urge that these items be set aside, and dealt with outside of the full OP review at some point in the future, and that in the interim their clients would be pleased to arrange a session with their quality and transportation consultants so that they may demonstrate that drive-through facilities are not a problem.</p>	<p>Refer to Item No. 134 of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>
289	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Davis Legal Advisors</p>	<p>Concerns are identified regarding the following issues:</p> <p>1) Retaining archaeological sites and the Determination of "Significant" Archaeological sites.</p>	<p>The Vaughan Official Plan policies related to archaeology as found in Section Six of the OP have been developed and are in keeping with the Ministry of Culture's "Draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2009)"</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>FOR: Nupan Corporation</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan (City-Wide)</p>	<p>Section: 6.4.1.3 (a) and (b) requires retaining of identified resources as greenspace or excluding such areas from development altogether. The exclusion of such areas from development once appropriate measures have been taken (as approved by the Ministry) is unduly restrictive.</p> <p>2) Commemoration of Sites</p> <p>Section: 6.4.1.3 (e) requires commemoration of previously disturbed sites. While commemoration may be appropriate in some instances, it should be made clear it is at the expense of the municipality and not the private sector.</p> <p>3) First Nations Consultation</p> <p>Section: 6.4.1.5 inserts a layer of consultation that is unnecessary and difficult to implement. The policy contemplates that "significant" archaeological resources be conserved unless there is agreement from First Nations. It is their client's position that this policy inappropriately delegates decision making to non-statutory and undefined interests. This is inappropriate and introduces far too much uncertainty into the process.</p>	<p>1) Decisions regarding the conservation of archaeological sites are always made in consultation with Ministry of Culture staff and the consulting licensed archaeologist hired by the property owner. Depending on the nature and significance of an identified archaeological site (which is verified by the Ministry of Culture and the consulting archaeologist) mitigative measures on how to preserve, avoid or remove the site are determined through the required archaeological assessment process set out by the above referenced "Standard". This process is also a requirement under the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>All archaeological sites do not have the same significance or scope. For example, generally a European settlement site is treated different than a 16th century aboriginal village site or a burial site. The OP policies outline the range of measures that can be undertaken to treat various levels of significance. Significant archaeological sites at times will have to be preserved in situ or be avoided in the development of lands depending of the size, significance and scope of the site. As all sites do not have the same significance, each will have to be treated on an individual basis in consultation with</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>the Ministry of Culture, the landowner and the licensed consultant archaeologist.</p> <p>2) This is a common current practice for significant sites and the requirement of commemoration of site or who is responsible to pay for them is dealt with during the development process. There are many sites which commemoration is not a requirement and it is determined that no identifying markers would best serve the safety of the site.</p> <p>3) As it relates to First Nations consultation, the Ministry of Culture now recommends municipalities to consult First Nations when significant aboriginal village/burial sites are found. (See referenced draft Standards). This is a practice, while not new, is now being highly recommended in recognition of aboriginal history especially when ancestral burial sites are found.</p>	
<p>293</p>	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association (KARA)</p>	<p>The respondent has submitted concerns and questions as a follow-up to their letter of May 17, 2010 (Item No. 76 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report).</p> <p>1) Concern is raised regarding the annual growth rate projection of 2%.</p> <p>2) Concern is raised that the "required</p>	<p>1) Population projections are provided by the Province of Ontario.</p> <p>2) May 17, 2010, represents the Public Hearing date for Volume 1.</p> <p>3) The Vaughan Official Plan cannot be approved until the Region Plan is approved. Any changes to Vaughan's</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>Secondary Plan Areas" date is very late in the OP Review process.</p> <p>3) Would like to know if approval of Vaughan's Official Plan should wait until the Regional Plan is completed to allow bringing Vaughan's Official Plan into conformity.</p> <p>4) Respondent opposed elimination of jog at Pine Valley Drive and Teston Roads. Believes jog elimination should be performed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>5) Request clarification as to whether a parking authority will be established before changes are made to parking requirements in the zoning by-laws.</p> <p>6) Request clarification as to whether changes in parking by-laws will affect all of Vaughan or just the secondary plan areas.</p> <p>7) Request Policy 9.1.1.8e be extended to prohibit rear-lotting on open space.</p> <p>8) Request clarification as to whether the designation of "Low-Rise Residential" will apply to all of Vaughan, and how this will apply to By-law 1-88.</p> <p>9) Request clarification as to whether all zonings will change in Vaughan following revision of By-law 1-88.</p>	<p>Official Plan resulting from modifications to the Regional Official Plan will be addressed through the Regional approval of Vaughan's Official Plan to ensure conformity.</p> <p>4) The lands to the south of Teston Road on both the east and west sides of Pine Valley Drive are included in the Block 40/47 development application process. Lands to the north of Teston Road and west of Pine Valley Drive are in the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan area, including the Natural Heritage System overlay.</p> <p>An "unclassified wetland" is identified at the northwest corner of Teston Road and Pine Valley Drive on Schedule 'G1' of OPA 600. As noted in the natural heritage background report, Natural Heritage in the City (AECOM 2010), the Ministry of Natural Resources has recently evaluated wetlands in the East Humber River watershed. The findings of the wetland evaluation will need to be considered in any environmental assessment regarding a jog elimination at Teston Road and Pine Valley Drive.</p> <p>A watercourse extending from the southeast corner to the northwest corner of Teston Road and Pine Valley Drive is</p>	<p>6) Not Applicable.</p> <p>7) That Section 7.3.2.7 be amended to include reference to rear-lotting for development next to open space.</p> <p>8) Not Applicable.</p> <p>9) Not Applicable.</p> <p>10) Not Applicable.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>10) Request clarification as to whether zoning permitted under Policy 9.2.2.1b (iv) will apply to all of Vaughan.</p>	<p>included in the Core Features delineation as shown on Schedule 2 of the Official Plan. The Core Features also include a Regionally Significant Forest located at the northwest corner of Teston Road and Pine Valley Drive. As a result, any options for road alignments should consider the Core Features policies of the Official Plan as well as Greenbelt Plan policies regarding infrastructure (Section 4.2) and natural heritage features (Section 3.2).</p> <p>5) As part of the City's Parking Standards Review, Council directed that a Working Committee be established to review the issues related to establishing a Parking Authority. It is expected that the revised parking standards by-law will be considered by Council prior to the establishment of a Parking Authority, however at this point in time exact timing cannot be confirmed.</p> <p>6) Changes to the City's parking standards under the City of Vaughan Parking Standards Review are being considered on a City-wide basis.</p> <p>7) Staff concur with this request and recommend that Section 7.3.2.7 be amended to reference open spaces.</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>8) The Vaughan Official Plan will apply City-wide, subject to the area and site specific policies contained in Volume 2.</p> <p>9) A new city-wide zoning by-law will be prepared to implement the Official Plan.</p> <p>10) Section 9.2.2.1b iv) of the Official Plan will apply to all lands designated Low-Rise Residential on Schedule 13 of the Official Plan and subject to the area and site specific policies contained in Volume 2.</p>	
<p>295</p>	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Frank Greco</p> <p>FOR: Andrea Greco and Carmela Greco</p> <p>LOCATION: 9560 Islington Ave.</p>	<p>This is a follow-up letter to Item No. 170 considered in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>Objects to Schedules 13 and 13-M as they relate to the subject property. The proposed future development of the subject property requires a designation of "Mid-Rise Mixed-Use" permitting an 8 storey 181 residential unit condominium with 2.53 FSI. Objections stem from the incongruency between proposed future development and policies in the Official Plan including but not limited to density, land use designation, and building height.</p>	<p>The applicant's request has been reviewed and Staff do not concur with the suggested amendment to the Official Plan.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
301	<p>DATE: July 21, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Diane Nasr O'Young Kayo O'Young</p> <p>LOCATION: 5737 Kirby Rd.</p>	<p>1) Are not in support of the Plan, and the designation of their lands entirely green space.</p>	<p>1) The subject lands are designated "Protected Countryside" with the "Natural Heritage System" overlay within the Province's Greenbelt Plan Area. The subject lands are designated "Natural Areas" and "Countryside" on Schedule 1- Urban Structure and "Natural Areas" within Schedule 13-G which also shows the boundary of the Greenbelt Plan Area and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area.</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p>
302	<p>DATE: July 27, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Canadian Petroleum Products Institute</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>This is a follow-up letter to Item No. 16A and 16B of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>1) Section 5.2.3.7 -Requests deletion of second sentence to be replaced with: <i>"In addition to and recognition of Intensification Areas and Heritage Conservation Districts which are already subject to a prohibition of drive-through facilities, it is intended that the prohibition shall also pertain to all Intensification Areas except Primary Intensification Corridors That are not Regional Corridors as identified on Schedule 1."</i></p> <p>2) Section: 9.2- Land Use Designations and Permitted Buildings Types (9.2.2.4 (b); Mid-Rise Mixed-Use, 9.2.2.6 (b); High-Rise Mixed-Use, 9.2.2.7 (b); Commercial Mixed-Use, 9.2.2.10</p>	<p>1) 2) Refer to the comments for Item No. 16A of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p> <p>3) 4) An amendment is proposed to the Official Plan that recognizes existing land use as they exist at the time the Official Plan is adopted. The proposed amendment is identified in Item No. 180, Recommendation # 8 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>	<p>1) 2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) 4) See Recommendation 8) of Item No. 180 in the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>(b); and Prestige Employment. The proponent is opposed to the policies that restrict the number of gasoline stations along arterial roads to one gas station per intersection.</p> <p>3) Do not want existing gasoline stations and retail businesses with drive-through uses to become legal non-compliant.</p> <p>4) Schedule 13 – Northwest corner of Jane Street and Major Mackenzie Drive is shown as Major Institutional. This designation does not allow gas stations. Requesting gas stations existing at the time the new Official Plan comes into effect continue to be permitted.</p>		
<p>306</p>	<p>DATE: July 29, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Jeffrey Stone</p> <p>LOCATION: City-wide</p>	<p>1) The respondent has identified multiple issues and concerns on a general basis, requesting that adequate and convenient transit be provided, which is competitive and affordable and attractive to all users. Proposes the location of GO Stations at higher density locations and outlines areas where they should be located.</p> <p>2) Affordable housing should be in compact development, as this would make a work-live-play community more viable.</p> <p>3) More high rise buildings be placed along arterial roads in the southern section of the City.</p>	<p>1) The Plan provides for increased densities throughout the City and identifies substantial improvements to the Transit Network (Schedule 10).</p> <p>The location of GO Stations is the responsibility of the Province which has not identified additional GO station locations at this time.</p> <p>2) The new Official Plan designates significant amount of lands for compact mixed-residential development. Section 7.5.1 includes policies to address affordable housing and the Official Plan</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p> <p>3) No change is recommended.</p> <p>4) No change is recommended.</p> <p>5) No change is recommended.</p> <p>6) No is change recommended.</p> <p>7) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
		<p>4) Respondent suggests policies should be included to facilitate a grid road system wherever possible.</p> <p>5) The respondent enquires as to why there is no mention of the future Avenue 7 LRT, Major Mackenzie Busway or 407 Transitway by name.</p> <p>6) The respondent suggests a number of Transportation Oriented Development (T.O.D) policies for inclusion into the Plan.</p> <p>7) The respondent suggests that there should be a regional parking authority.</p>	<p>includes policies to encourage compact development.</p> <p>3) The Plan provides for Intensification in the south part of the City including the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, Yonge Steeles Secondary Plan, the Primary Intensification Corridors.</p> <p>4) The policies of Section 4.2 – The Transportation Network encourage a grid like street network.</p> <p>5) Schedule 10 of the Vaughan Official Plan identifies a Highway Bus Service, Highway 7 and Major Mackenzie Regional as Rapid Transit Corridors.</p> <p>6) The Official Plan includes specific T.O.D policies in Section 4.2.2.12. to 4.2.2.17 inclusive including other policies that support transit oriented development. Many of the comments made are very specific and typically not included in the Official Plan.</p> <p>7) Policies are included in the Plan that enable a municipal parking authority. The establishment of a regional parking authority is beyond the purview of this Official Plan.</p>	

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
310	<p>DATE: July 28, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Weston Consulting Group Inc.</p> <p>FOR: Various Landowners</p> <p>LOCATION: Vaughan</p>	<p>This letter is a follow-up to Item No. 163 of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report. A request is made to consider adding two suggested policies to Section 3.2.3.4 that allow some flexibility to the requirements for 10 m and 30 m buffers as follows:</p> <p>a) Any buffer, vegetation protection zone can be reduced based on the appropriate natural scientific studies and investigations; and,</p> <p>b) that the final buffer zones be compensated through purchase or additional development coverage applied to the remaining tableland.</p>	<p>1) References to a 30 m "minimum vegetation protection zone" (MVPZ) in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) of Policy 3.2.3.4 always refer to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) and/or Greenbelt Plan. These are the minimum ecological buffers noted for specific ecological features in the policies of these provincial plans. According to the ORMCP and Greenbelt Plan, any development within 120 m of a Key Natural Heritage Feature (KNHF) or Key Hydrologic Feature (KHF) requires a natural heritage evaluation, which may determine that larger ecological buffers are required (see 23(d) and 26(4)(c) of the ORMCP). KNHFs and KHFs are delineated as Core Features in the City of Vaughan Official Plan. MVPZs are internal to the ORMCP and Greenbelt Plan boundaries. Any decisions to extend the MVPZ outside of the ORMCP and Greenbelt Plan boundaries will be based on appropriate ecological studies, such as a natural heritage evaluation, as part of the Secondary Plan process or through applications for development under the <i>Planning Act</i> or <i>Condominium Act, 1998</i> or via a municipal zoning by-law update.</p> <p>2) Policy 3.2.3.9 addresses the intent of the City to seek that Core Features and</p>	<p>1) No change is recommended.</p> <p>2) No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>their vegetation protections zones to be conveyed into public ownership. Policy 3.2.3.1(c) addresses alternative mechanisms for securing lands in the Natural Heritage Network.</p>	
<p>312</p>	<p>DATE: July 23, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Pound & Stewart</p> <p>FOR: Royal Group Inc.</p> <p>LOCATION: Regalcrest Court</p>	<p>Letter respecting Item No. 180 of the July 28, 2010, Special Committee of the Whole Report indicating that a subsequent letter will be provided outlining their response to Staff's comments at a future date.</p>	<p>Receipt of the letter is acknowledged.</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>
<p>320</p>	<p>DATE: August 06, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: EMC Group Limited</p> <p>FOR: Domenic Marzano (Enza Realty Limited)</p> <p>LOCATION: Part Lot 24,</p>	<p>Request an increase in density and building height, as well as, an expansion to the "Local Centre" and Low-Rise Mixed-Use" designations to reflect the existing zoning provisions under By-law 1-88 on the property.</p>	<p>The applicant is requesting that the Low-Rise Mixed-Use (Schedule 13-G) designation and the "Local Centre" designation (Schedule 1) be extended westerly to Highway 27 to conform with current provisions of Zoning By-law 1-88. This would result in the elimination of the "Natural Areas" designation at the southeast corner of Highway 27 and Nashville Road.</p> <p>Minor modifications to the "Core Features" boundaries can be facilitated in accordance with the revised</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>Concession 8 (South side of Nashville Road east of Highway 27)</p>		<p>environmental policies identified in Item 19-B of the Special Committee of the Whole Report of July 28, 2010. Redesignation of the lands to permit townhouses and the limits of the Core Feature should be considered through the development process.</p>	
<p>322</p>	<p>DATE: August 12, 2010</p> <p>RESPONDENT: EMC Group Ltd.</p> <p>FOR: 1431613 Ontario Limited</p> <p>LOCATION: Northeast quadrant of Major Mackenzie Drive and Highway 27 (Part of Lots 19 and 20, Con. 8)</p>	<p>Request clarification that:</p> <p>1) density policy provisions in OPA 610 are no longer applicable;</p> <p>2) permitted density provisions would be comparable to the New Community Areas density requirements;</p> <p>3) new development will be determined through the regulatory process of developing and approving the requisite implementing applications, 'tertiary plan', and urban design plan.</p>	<p>A site-specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment will be required. The Low-Rise Residential designation for the property under the new Official Plan is consistent with existing permissions on the site.</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Attachment 1

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

Item	Submission	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
323	DATE: July 29, 2010 RESPONDENT: Wood Bull LLP FOR: SmartCentres Inc. LOCATION: General vicinity of Highways 400 and 7 and, Highways 427 and 7	This letter was submitted in response to Item No. 73B of the July 28, 2010 Special Committee of the Whole Report. Concerned that Staff has not recommended any changes to the Official Plan to address the issues raised in their letter of June 7, 2010. They urge that these concerns be addressed prior to any further consideration of the Draft OP.	Staff has further reviewed the issues raised and the previous comments and recommendations to Item No. 73B of the Special Committee of the Whole Meeting of July 28, 2010 are maintained.	No change is recommended.