

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (1) – JANUARY 19, 2021**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**Distributed January 8, 2021**

**Item(s)**

C1. Mr. Michael E. Oldham, dated January 4, 2021. 9, 10, 11

**Distributed January 15, 2021**

C2. Presentation material, *entitled “Community Engagement Citizens, stakeholders and the City of Vaughan”*. 5

C3. Margaret and Vince Sassi, dated January 14, 2021. Presentation #1

C4. Mr. Rino Mostacci, Solmar Development Corp., presentation material. Presentation #1

**Distributed January 18, 2021**

C5. Mr. Michael E. Oldham, dated January 4, 2021. 9, 10, 11

C6. Ms. Amanda Maraj, dated January 15, 2021. Presentation #1

C7. Sanja Milicic, dated January 16, 2021. Presentation #1

C8. Mr. Douglas Carl, dated January 16, 2021. Presentation #1

C9. Ms. Susan Sigrist, dated January 16, 2021. Presentation #1

C10. Mr. Joseph Gianna, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C11. Ms. Antonietta Cina, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C12. Mahdi and Maryam Tafreshnai, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C13. Ms. Maryam Abbasi, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C14. Mr. Jonathan Virtu, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C15. Samantha and Christopher, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C16. Mr. Joseph Mazzolino, dated January 17, 2021. Presentation #1

C17. Adriana & Rosetta Sinopoli, Rosa & Domenic Meleca, Ezia Archese and Maria Fontes, dated January 18, 2021. Presentation #1

C18. Ms. Laura Rinaldo, President, South Maple Ratepayers, dated January 18, 2021. Presentation #1

**Disclaimer Respecting External Communications**

Communications are posted on the City’s website pursuant to Procedure By-law Number 7-2011. The City of Vaughan is not responsible for the validity or accuracy of any facts and/or opinions contained in external Communications listed on printed agendas and/or agendas posted on the City’s website.

**Please note there may be further Communications.**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (1) – JANUARY 19, 2021**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

---

C19.	Professor Robert Kenedy, dated January 18, 2021.	Presentation #1
C20.	Memorandum from the City Manager, dated January 19, 2021.	9, 10, 11
C21.	Memorandum from the City Manager, dated January 19, 2021.	9
C22.	Memorandum from the City Manager, dated January 19, 2021.	10
C23.	Memorandum from the City Manager, dated January 19, 2021.	11
C24.	Ms. Irene Zeppieri, dated January 18, 2021.	Presentation #1
C25.	Ms. Connie Mucci, dated January 18, 2021.	Presentation #1
C26.	Mr. Andrew Bruno, dated January 18, 2021.	Presentation #1

**Disclaimer Respecting External Communications**

Communications are posted on the City's website pursuant to Procedure By-law Number 7-2011. The City of Vaughan is not responsible for the validity or accuracy of any facts and/or opinions contained in external Communications listed on printed agendas and/or agendas posted on the City's website.

**Please note there may be further Communications.**

**C1**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Items # - 9, 10, 11**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: Block 59 West Landowners Group - City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026, Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067  
**Date:** January-05-21 2:52:48 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[2021-01-04 Anatolia Block 59 Interim Sanitary Servicing Response.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Oldham, Michael <Michael.Oldham@wsp.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 04, 2021 5:33 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Josh Berry (Anatolia Capital Corp) <Josh.Berry@anatoliacapitalcorp.com>; Reeve Whitman <RWhitman@toromont.com>; Andrew Zappone <AZappone@dgggroup.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] Block 59 West Landowners Group - City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026, Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067

Please find attached a letter dated January 4, 2021 addressed to the Mayor and Members of Council.

We request that you distribute it to the Mayor and Members of Council for the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole meeting.

Thank you,

**Michael E. Oldham, P.Eng.**  
Senior Director, Land Development



T 905-882-7316 | M 647-222-1642

100 Commerce Valley Drive West  
Thornhill, Ontario L3T 0A1 Canada  
[wsp.com](http://wsp.com)

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. You are receiving this communication because you are listed as a current WSP contact. Should you have any questions regarding WSP's electronic communications policy, please consult our Anti-Spam Commitment at [www.wsp.com/casl](http://www.wsp.com/casl). For any concern or if you believe you should not be receiving this message, please forward this message to [caslcompliance@wsp.com](mailto:caslcompliance@wsp.com) so that we can promptly address your request. Note that not all messages sent by WSP qualify as commercial electronic messages.

AVIS : Ce message, incluant tout fichier l'accompagnant (« le message »), peut contenir des renseignements ou de l'information privilégiés, confidentiels, propriétaires ou à divulgation restreinte en vertu de la loi. Ce message est destiné à l'usage exclusif du/des

destinataire(s) voulu(s). Toute utilisation non permise, divulgation, lecture, reproduction, modification, diffusion ou distribution est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, ou que vous n'êtes pas un destinataire autorisé ou voulu, veuillez en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et détruire le message et toute copie électronique ou imprimée. Vous recevez cette communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-pourriel au [www.wsp.com/lcap](http://www.wsp.com/lcap). Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au [conformitelcap@wsp.com](mailto:conformitelcap@wsp.com) afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.

-LAEmHhHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKl



January 4, 2021

Mayor and Members of City Council  
City of Vaughan  
c/o Office of the City Clerk  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1

Dear Mayor and Members of Council:

**Subject: Block 59 West Landowners Group**  
City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026,  
Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067  
8811 Huntington Road, 6560 Langstaff Road and 9151 Huntington Road  
City of Vaughan

On behalf of our client, Anatolia Group, DG Group and Toromont Industries who are participants in Block 59 West Landowners Group, we are writing in response to concerns presented by ZZEN/ Blocks 57/58 as it relates to the City's interim sanitary servicing strategy regarding Block 59.

The correspondence sent to the City on behalf of ZZEN and Block 57/58 on November 30, 2020, indicates that the proposal to drain to the Huntington Road sewer pending the Regional sewer installation (targeted for 2028) in Highway 27 may delay or prevent the development of the remaining undeveloped lands in Block 57/58 for their approved land uses. This concern is set out in the letter dated November 30, 2020 from Urban Ecosystems. In our opinion, servicing Block 59 West via the Huntington Road sanitary sewer on an interim basis does not present any risk to development of the remaining undeveloped lands within Block 57/58.

First, we note that the interim sanitary servicing strategy intended for Block 59 West is consistent with the interim servicing strategy endorsed by City Council in October 2020. In particular, on October 14, 2020, Council endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Interim Servicing Study prepared by Civica Infrastructure Inc. dated April 2020. The study completed by Civica included the Block 59 lands east of Rainbow Creek, west of Highway 427 as tributary to the Huntington sewer.

The Staff Report that related to the Interim Servicing Strategy noted that "The study concluded that capacity within the existing outlets will be able to safely accommodate future developments on an interim basis while maintaining acceptable level of service as long as identified Risk Measurement Measures are followed."

Additionally, the ultimate sanitary servicing strategy proposed by the Region of York has always contemplated that the lands west of Rainbow Creek (41.55ha) within Block 59 West would be serviced via the Huntington Road sewer. Only the lands within that portion of Block 59 West that are located on the east side of Rainbow Creek (55.70ha) and west of Highway 427 will drain to Huntington Road on an interim basis.

The Risk Measurement Measures required for the Huntington sewer catchment area include flow monitoring to confirm actual flow generation. The development proposed within Block 59 West are employment uses, namely, large scale warehouse uses, which typically produce significantly lower flow per development hectare than other forms of development.



The Civica study recommended that for lands within the Huntington Road sanitary sewer catchment area that the York Region SIP standards be applied. This reduces the flow generation allowable to 265 L/cap/day. This recommendation is reflected in the required conditions of site plan approval, which require that, the “Owner shall commit to York Region’s Servicing Incentive Program (SIP) to the satisfaction of York Region and the City”

In comparison we have reviewed the water bills for the Anatolia existing office/warehouse building at 8300 Huntington Road. This building has a significantly greater office component than expected for development within Block 59 West. The average daily usage for 2019 and 2020 to November 16<sup>th</sup> is 13.76 cu.m/day. Given the site area of 10.04 ha and the City’s criteria of 95 people/ha, the flow rate is 14.4 L/cap/day, which is significantly lower than the Region’s SIP criteria of 265 L/cap/day. In our opinion, it is very unlikely that Block 59 West will ever be close to generating the allowance sanitary discharge per the Civica report.

In addition, the Block 59 West lands (east of Rainbow Creek) that will drain to Huntington Road on an interim basis will do so via an interim pumping station and opportunities are available to have the pumping station discharge at off-peak times.

On behalf of our clients, we request that the City confirm its support of the interim sanitary servicing strategy as it relates to Block 59 West and recommend that Council approve the Anatolia applications. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at 905-882-7316.

Yours very truly,

**WSP CANADA INC.**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Oldham', written over the company name.

Michael E. Oldham, P. Eng.  
Senior Director, Land Development

- c. Josh Berry, Anatolia Capital Corp.  
Andrew Zappone, One-Foot Developments Inc.  
Reeve Whitman, Toromont Industries


# Community Engagement

Citizens, stakeholders and the City of Vaughan



# Community Engagement

---



The process by which citizens and stakeholders **learn** together and **work** together on behalf of their communities and in **collaboration** with their local government to create and realize **sustainable and future-defining visions** for the community.



# Corporate Policy

---

- Stakeholder and Community Engagement Policy
- Our formal commitment
- A directional process based on internationally recognized standards, best practices and methodology
- Considers the needs and aspirations of Vaughan staff and the public
- Anchors the City's Community Engagement Framework



# Foundational Beliefs

---

- City building is a collective effort
- Vaughan values the voice of its citizens
- Everyone has wisdom to contribute to support sustainable decision-making
- Constructive dialogue that is open, transparent, accessible and inclusive makes for better decision-making

# IAP2

---

- International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) – [iap2.org](http://iap2.org)
- Internationally recognized best practices for engagement – the “gold standard”
- City staff have participated in professional skills and knowledge development through interactive, practitioner-endorsed and IAP2-licensed training and have successfully received internationally recognized certificates of completion
- VOR engagement specialists must have IAP2 knowledge and training

# Outputs/Outcomes

---

- A multi-faceted and overbuilt approach
- Seek out opportunities to engage:
  - with Vaughan's **diverse** community
  - with a **variety** of stakeholders
  - beyond the "**usual suspects**"
  - internally with **employees**
- Promote participation through various channels, new digital options
- Engage at convenient times/places to increase participation
- Promote a go-to-where-the-public-is approach
- Provide strategic advice and support to staff

# Data Driven (2015-20)



# Forward Together

---

- Community engagement fundamental to city-building
- Is all about upholding democracy
- Is an exercise in relationship-building and creating a culture of trust and understanding between citizens and their local government
- All about welcoming the public into the crucial conversations that will shape the city they know and love — the city of Vaughan





Thank You.





**C3**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Items # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] 2-36 storey Towers north of Bellaria (Jane and Rutherford)  
**Date:** January-15-21 9:22:17 AM

---

---

**From:** lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 14, 2021 5:24 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** Fwd: [External] 2-36 storey Towers north of Bellaria (Jane and Rutherford)

This is in reference I believe of next week's presentation #1 at CW.

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Margaret and Vince Sassi <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** January 14, 2021 at 3:54:15 PM EST  
**To:** [Council@vaughan.ca](mailto:Council@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** [External] 2-36 storey Towers north of Bellaria (Jane and Rutherford)

We are residents at Bellaria and object to the height of these buildings. On the south they would have Bellaria which are 4 - 17/18 storey buildings and to the north there are small strip plazas, town houses and houses. These 36 storey buildings would tower over everything in the area blocking light and views not to mention further congestion of cars which is already bad at best! THE CITY OF VAUGHAN SHOULD REFUSE PERMISSION OF THESE HEIGHTS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE RESIDENTS LIVING IN THE AREA!!! Traffic is already at maximum, what will it become with thousands more people and hundreds more cars. We object vehemently!!!

***Margaret and Vince Sassi***

# Rino Mostacci, MCIP, RPP

---




# Background and Basis for Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) requests

---

Seeking favourable consideration for a supportive resolution for an amendment to an existing MZO for ***Park Avenue Place III*** (9095 Jane St.)

Seeking favourable consideration for City Council for a supportive resolution for a MZO for ***Bellaria II*** (9291 Jane St.)







Park Avenue Place III, (9095 Jane St.)

---

# Park Avenue Place III, (9095 Jane St.)



---

Solmar respectfully requests the final phase of the Park Ave Place to also be included in the existing MZO.

The Minister can amend the existing MZO subject to a supportive resolution from the City.

Beneficial as it would allow for a more expeditious completion of the final phase of the Park Ave Place.





# Bellaria II, (9291 Jane St.)

---

Bellaria Condominium project was approved in 2005 and completed by 2012 (900 units).

Bellaria II is the final phase and will add 760 units, including approximately 80 “affordable” dwellings.

Current zoning permits commercial development.





# Bellaria II, (9291 Jane St.)

---

MZO to advance the residential zoning and site plan approval.


Will address delays (24 months) in the approval process.





Expedites supply and reduces the cost of housing.

It would support jobs and pandemic economic recovery in Vaughan.

Proximity to a future MTSA.





LEGEND	
	SITE
	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
	APPROVED DEVELOPMENT
	BUILT DEVELOPMENT



# Bellaria II, (9291 Jane St.)

---



Tower B  
36 STY  
390 u.  
PHASE 2

Tower A  
38 STY  
370 u.  
PHASE 1

5 STY

5 STY

5 STY  
GREEN ROOF

LOUNGE /  
FIRE PITS

13 VISITOR PARKING

14 VISITOR PARKING

PROPERTY LINE

PHASE 1

PHASE 2

NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURE BUFFER LIMITS  
10m BUFFER

TOP OF BANK

LIMIT OF PROPOSED 3:1  
SLOPE TO  
MATCH  
EXISTING  
GRADE  
CONTAINED  
OUTSIDE OF  
DRIPLINE

PROPOSED  
BIO-RETENTION  
FACILITY

VALLE

OVERFLOW  
SPILLWAY  
ELEVATION  
DETERMINED  
CHANNEL

RACE PROTECT (ON HOARDING) / EX. 216.50

EX. 216.50

EX. 216.50

SUB-SURFACE  
DRAIN

CONCRETE WALL

CONCRETE WALL

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

TRANSFORMER

# Thank you

---

Questions & Comments





**C5**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Items # - 9, 10, 11**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: Block 59 West Landowners Group - City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026, Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067  
**Date:** January-15-21 3:38:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)  
[2021-01-15 Block 59 Interim Sanitary Solution.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Oldham, Michael <Michael.Oldham@wsp.com>

**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2021 3:29 PM

**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca

**Cc:** Josh Berry (Anatolia Capital Corp) <Josh.Berry@anatoliacapitalcorp.com>; Reeve Whitman <RWhitman@toromont.com>; Andrew Zappone <AZappone@dgggroup.ca>; Frieri, Michael <Michael.Frieri@vaughan.ca>; Harnum, Jim <Jim.Harnum@vaughan.ca>; Musacchio, Vince <Vince.Musacchio@vaughan.ca>; Peverini, Mauro <MAURO.PEVERINI@vaughan.ca>; Suppa, Frank <Frank.Suppa@vaughan.ca>; Madhusoothanan, Manu <Manu.Madhusoothanan@vaughan.ca>; Velasquez, Diego <Diego.Velasquez@vaughan.ca>; Artuso, Tony <Tony.Artuso@vaughan.ca>; Landolfi, Joe <Joe.Landolfi@vaughan.ca>; Couto, Carlos <Carlos.Couto@vaughan.ca>

**Subject:** [External] Block 59 West Landowners Group - City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026, Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067

Please find attached a letter dated January 15, 2021 addressed to the Mayor and Members of Council.

We request that you distribute it to the Mayor and Members of Council for the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole meeting.

Thank you,

**Michael E. Oldham, P.Eng.**  
Senior Director, Land Development



T 905-882-7316 | M 647-222-1642

100 Commerce Valley Drive West  
Thornhill, Ontario L3T 0A1 Canada  
[wsp.com](http://wsp.com)

prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. You are receiving this communication because you are listed as a current WSP contact. Should you have any questions regarding WSP's electronic communications policy, please consult our Anti-Spam Commitment at [www.wsp.com/casl](http://www.wsp.com/casl). For any concern or if you believe you should not be receiving this message, please forward this message to [caslcompliance@wsp.com](mailto:caslcompliance@wsp.com) so that we can promptly address your request. Note that not all messages sent by WSP qualify as commercial electronic messages.

AVIS : Ce message, incluant tout fichier l'accompagnant (« le message »), peut contenir des renseignements ou de l'information privilégiés, confidentiels, propriétaires ou à divulgation restreinte en vertu de la loi. Ce message est destiné à l'usage exclusif du/des destinataire(s) voulu(s). Toute utilisation non permise, divulgation, lecture, reproduction, modification, diffusion ou distribution est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, ou que vous n'êtes pas un destinataire autorisé ou voulu, veuillez en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et détruire le message et toute copie électronique ou imprimée. Vous recevez cette communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-pourriel au [www.wsp.com/lcap](http://www.wsp.com/lcap). Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au [conformitelcap@wsp.com](mailto:conformitelcap@wsp.com) afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.

-LAEmHhHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKl





January 15, 2021


Mayor and Members of City Council  
City of Vaughan  
c/o Office of the City Clerk  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1

Dear Mayor and Members of Council:

Subject: **Block 59 West Landowners Group**  
City Files: BL. 59.2014; Zoning By-law Amendment Files Z18.025, Z18.026, Z.18.027; Site Plan Development Files DA.18.065, DA.18.066, DA.18.067  
8811 Huntington Road, 6560 Langstaff Road and 9151 Huntington Road  
City of Vaughan

On behalf of our clients, Anatolia Group, DG Group and Toromont Industries who are participants in Block 59 West Landowners Group, we are writing in to provide their concurrence with the interim sanitary sewer outlet solution presented by staff in a meeting on January 12, 2021 and email dated January 14, 2021 from Michael Friere the Manager of Infrastructure Planning and Engineering.

This solution was based on staff's capacity analysis confirming suitable residual system capacity downstream of Highway 27 and Milani/Medallion. The location of the interim connection to Medallion and ultimate connection of the future Regional truck sewer is shown on the sketch below.





Our Clients are in agreement with undertaking risk mitigation measures related to this solution (i.e. in-line flow control, CCTV, enhanced construction standards and assumptions protocols, and I/I reduction) as a requirement for the development of the Block 59 development lands. We further understand that if the monitor indicates a potential issue, that Block 59 West will undertake storage equalization upstream of the Highway 27 location.

On behalf of our clients, we request that the City confirm the acceptance of this interim solution for Block 59 West and recommend that Council approve the Anatolia applications. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at 905-882-7316.

Yours very truly,

**WSP CANADA INC.**

Michael E. Oldham, P.Eng.  
Senior Director, Land Development

c. Josh Berry, Anatolia Capital Corp.  
Reeve Whitman, Toromont Industries  
Michael Frieri, City of Vaughan  
Vince Musacchio, City of Vaughan  
Frank Suppa, City of Vaughan  
Diego Velasquez, City of Vaughan  
Joe Landolfi, City of Vaughan

Andrew Zappone, One-Foot Develop. Inc.  
Jim Harnum, City of Vaughan  
Mauro Peverini, City of Vaughan  
Manu Madhusoothanan, City of Vaughan  
Tony Artuso, City of Vaughan  
Carlos Couto, City of Vaughan

**C6**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 8:59:03 AM

---

---

**From:** Amanda Maraj [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2021 9:19 PM  
**To:** [Council@vaughan.ca](mailto:Council@vaughan.ca)  
**Cc:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** [External] Re: Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Please accept my email as a Negative for solmars new building development on jane street maple.

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

---

**From:** Amanda Maraj  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2021 9:13:25 PM  
**To:** [council@vaughan.ca](mailto:council@vaughan.ca) <[council@vaughan.ca](mailto:council@vaughan.ca)>  
**Cc:** [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca) <[clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca)>  
**Subject:** Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

To whom this may concern,

I would like to leave my comment concerning the solmar project 9291 Jane Street.

Putting up the condos beside 9255 jane street, will be distruping to those who currently reside on the North side of the building. These new buildings will take away from residents' view, Can potentially have a negative impact on condo sales and rentals for Owners and possibly de-value the condo units. I hope you take my opinion into consideration as I am a resident of Tower 4.

Thank you for your time,

Amanda

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

**C7**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Solmar Development Presentation #1 Jan 18, 2021  
**Date:** January-18-21 8:59:11 AM

---

**From:** Sanja Milicic [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 16, 2021 11:54 AM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Solmar Development Presentation #1 Jan 18, 2021

Dear members of council,

I am emailing you to ask you NOT to support an MZO for 9291 Jane St. without a full public planning process.

There is already too much current and future development at the intersection of Jane and Rutherford. The infrastructure does not and will not support the volume of people and cars living in that area.

We have to stop empowering developers by giving them the power to build on every single parcel of land, big or small, in this City. Supporting this MZO takes public involvement out of the planning process and will reinforce the message that developers can build wherever they want in Vaughan.

Please consider this email asking you NOT to support an MZO for 9291 Jane St. without a full public planning process.

Regards,

Sanja Milicic

**C8**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 8:59:47 AM

---

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 16, 2021 3:41 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; Rob Kenedy [REDACTED]; Tim Madden [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Office of the City Clerk and Members of Vaughan City Council:

This underhanded approach by deputation to seek Council support for a Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) that precludes public discussion, debate or comment is a clear insult to every taxpayer in the City of Vaughan, as well as to thoughtful council members and employees of the municipality's Planning Department. Members of Council are clearly aware that MZO's being issued without restraint by the current government of Ontario are rapidly reaching a pandemic level of their own, creating similar devastating effects in the community!!

It is surely unthinkable that elected representatives, sworn to uphold the interests of the municipality and its citizens, might contemplate any action respecting this deputation other than its instant rejection, with direction to the developer to follow established due process in its quest for approval.

If a majority of Council could be so thoroughly compromised in its definition of its duty to its citizens (or perhaps so corrupt in its slavish devotion to developers) as to support this bold attempt to gain authorization by decree of an unapproved development, then Council should take the obvious next step and close the Planning Department as a cost-saving measure, in recognition of Council's dismissal of the normal planning process and its annulment of the department's historical authority, powers and standards in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,  
Douglas Carl, MBA, P. Eng.,  
[REDACTED] Kootenay Ridge,  
Maple, ON [REDACTED]

**C9**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Fwd: Solmar MZO Request and Public input  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:02:06 AM

---

---

**From:** Susan Sigrist [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 16, 2021 7:09 PM  
**To:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca); [Council@vaughan.ca](mailto:Council@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** [External] Fwd: Solmar MZO Request and Public input

Office of the City Clerk and Members of Vaughan City Council:

I am in complete agreement with Doug Carl's and Robert Kenedy's comments about MZO's in Vaughan and particularly Solmar's MZO request.

Sincerely,  
Susan Sigrist MBA P.Eng. REA  
Matterhorn Rd. Maple

Begin forwarded message:

On Sat, Jan 16, 2021 at 3:32 PM Robert A Kenedy <[rkenedy@yorku.ca](mailto:rkenedy@yorku.ca)> wrote:

Thank you, Doug!

Your email below clearly sums up how many us view MZO's in Vaughan and especially Solmar's MZO request. Provincially, Minister Clark has been repeatedly over-stepping his authority and Vaughan Council has also done so in terms of circumventing its own planning process, staff input, public contributions, and overall citizen participation. This puts council and the city of Vaughan (along with Minister Clark) in a very negative light of constantly pandering to developers and ignoring the proper planning process.

Best,

--

Robert Aaron Kenedy, PhD  
President of the MacKenzie Ridge Ratepayers Association

Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
238 McLaughlin College  
York University  
4700 Keele Street  
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3  
CANADA  
[rkenedy@yorku.ca](mailto:rkenedy@yorku.ca)  
416 736-2100 ext. 77458

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 16, 2021 1:23 PM  
**To:** [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca) <[clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca)>  
**Cc:** 'Iafrate, Marilyn' <[Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca](mailto:Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca)>; Robert A Kenedy [REDACTED]; Tim Madden [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Office of the City Clerk and Members of Vaughan City Council:

This underhanded approach by deputation to seek Council support for a Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) that precludes public discussion, debate or comment is a clear insult to every taxpayer in the City of Vaughan, as well as to thoughtful council members and employees of the municipality's Planning Department. Members of Council are clearly aware that MZO's being issued without restraint by the current government of Ontario are rapidly reaching a pandemic level of their own, creating similar devastating effects in the community!!

It is surely unthinkable that elected representatives, sworn to uphold the interests of the municipality and its citizens, might contemplate any action respecting this deputation other than its instant rejection, with direction to the developer to follow established due process in its quest for approval.

If a majority of Council could be so thoroughly compromised in its definition of its duty to its citizens (or perhaps so corrupt in its slavish devotion to developers) as to support this bold attempt to gain authorization by decree of an unapproved development, then Council should take the obvious next step and close the Planning Department as a cost-saving measure, in recognition of Council's dismissal of the normal planning process and its annulment of the department's historical authority, powers and standards in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,  
Douglas Carl, MBA, P. Eng.,  
[REDACTED] Kootenay Ridge,  
Maple, ON [REDACTED]

Robert A. Kenedy, PhD  
President of the MacKenzie Ridge Ratepayers Association  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
238 McLaughlin College  
York University  
4700 Keele Street  
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3  
CANADA  
[rkenedy@yorku.ca](mailto:rkenedy@yorku.ca)  
416 736-2100 ext. 77458  
FAX 416 736-5715

## **SOLMAR DEVELOPMENT CORP. MZO REQUEST - 9291 Jane Street next to Bellaria Towers**

The developer is asking for Council support of an MZO (Ministerial Zoning Order) for two 36-storey towers at 9291 Jane St. during the Committee of the Whole (1) meeting taking place Tuesday, January 19, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

MZOs, once granted by the Province, by-passes much of the Planning process and

limits public participation.

Because this is being introduced onto the agenda by Solmar as a deputation, the public has no opportunity to speak "virtually" on this matter.

Should you wish to comment, please send an email to [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca) and in the Subject line state: Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request.

Electronic meetings can be watched live at [vaughan.ca/LiveCouncil](http://vaughan.ca/LiveCouncil).

---

### Committee of the Whole (1)

Tuesday, January 19, 2021

1:00 p.m.

#### This is an Electronic Meeting

Public comments can be submitted by email to [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca).

If you wish to speak to an item listed on the Agenda, please pre-register by contacting Access Vaughan at 905-832-2281 or [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca) by noon on the last business day before the meeting.

Electronic meetings can be watched live at [vaughan.ca/LiveCouncil](http://vaughan.ca/LiveCouncil).

#### [Agenda Item 6 -2](#)

##### **YORK REGION SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.20.037 2960 TESTON ROAD VICINITY OF TESTON ROAD AND JANE STREET**

**Purpose:** To seek approval from the Committee of the Whole for Site Development File DA.20.037 for the subject lands shown on Attachment 2. York Region proposes a paramedic response station with two ambulance bays as shown on Attachments 3 to 6

Click [here](#) for further information and to view documents.

#### [Agenda Item 6 - 4](#)

##### **PORTSIDE DEVELOPMENTS (KLEINBURG) INC. OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILE OP.18.021 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.17.018 SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.17.042 10568 ISLINGTON AVENUE VICINITY OF ISLINGTON AVENUE AND NASHVILLE ROAD**

**Purpose:** To seek approval from the Committee of the Whole for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Development Files OP.18.021, Z.17.018 and DA.17.042. The Owner proposes to amend the policies of the "Mainstreet Commercial" designation of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 and rezone the Subject Lands from "R1 Residential Zone" to "C11 Mainstreet Commercial Zone" to permit the development of a three-storey mixed-use building consisting of 558.44 m2 of at-grade commercial uses and a total of 16 rental residential units on the second and third floors as shown on Attachments 4 to 9.

Click [here](#) for further information and to view documents.

#### [Agenda Item 6 - 5](#)

##### **STAKEHOLDER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT POLICY**

**Purpose:** Community engagement is fundamental to the city-building process and recognized as a priority in the 2018-2022 Term of Council Service Excellence Strategic Plan. It is also a collective effort wherein citizens and stakeholders learn together and



work together on behalf of their communities and in collaboration with their local government to create and realize sustainable and future-defining visions for the community. Introducing a Stakeholder and Community Engagement Policy is not only a formal commitment to involving citizens, businesses and stakeholders in crucial conversations that will help shape the city they know and love, but it also offers a directional process based on internationally recognized standards, best practices and methodology. Community engagement is also an exercise in relationship-building which has the power to create a culture of trust and understanding between citizens and their local government, as well as build healthy communities.

Click [here](#) for further information and to view documents.

#### Agenda Item 6 - 6

##### **NAPIER STREET ROAD CLOSURE STATUS UPDATE**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this report is to provide an update on a work plan to undertake the feasibility of closing part or all of Napier Street at Stegman's Mill Road, including projected milestones and timelines.

Click [here](#) for further information and to view documents.

#### Agenda Item 6 - 7

##### **NORTH MAPLE REGIONAL PARK PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT UPDATE JANUARY 2021**

**Purpose:** To provide an update on Phase 2 park development at North Maple Regional Park (NMRP) including progress by the Technical Advisor consultant team on completion of 30% design and technical studies.

**C10**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 MZO Request.  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:03:16 AM

---

**From:** Joe Gianna [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 11:55 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** dougcarl@rogers.com; lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca> [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 MZO Request.

Please be advised that I strongly support Douglas Carl's letter submitted on Jan16,2021 via email.

Thank you.  
Joseph Gianna.  
[REDACTED] Laurentian Blvd.  
Maple ON [REDACTED]

**C11**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:03:29 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Antonietta Cina [REDACTED] >  
Sent: Sunday, January 17, 2021 1:31 PM  
To: Council@vaughan.ca  
Cc: Clerks@vaughan.ca  
Subject: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Comments regarding new building

I do not want these new buildings to share an entrance / grounds with Bellaria I . Too many people , especially with these new building having 36 floors. There should be a separation between the properties.

**C12**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Solmar Project North of Bellaria Residences  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:03:40 AM

---

**From:** Mahdi Tafreshnia <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 1:52 PM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Solmar Project North of Bellaria Residences

To whom it may concern,

We are residence at Bellaria [REDACTED] and we have just recently notified about the 2-36 story towers project (Solmar projects\_9291 Jane street) . We are writing to object to the height of these buildings as this is going to block light and views of our building which has a direct impact on our quality of [life.in](#) addition, Jane street is already overloaded with traffic congestion during rush hours plus Wonderland operational season. We would expect that the city of Vaughn take this seriously into consideration that the size and location of this project will significantly depreciate the quality of life for the residents living in the area. We seriously expect the city reconsideration of the approval.

Regards,  
Mahdi and Maryam Tafreshnai

**C13**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Solmar Project North of Bellaria  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:03:57 AM

---

**From:** Maryam Abbasi <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 2:03 PM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Solmar Project North of Bellaria

To whom it may concern,

Hello, we are residents of [REDACTED] Jane street and recently notified about the 2-36 story tower project of Solmar at the north of the Belarria buildings.

Please be noted that this project will significantly affect the light and view of our building, no need to mention the Jane traffic congestion which is already high. Moreover, it will increase the noise pollution of the area, with respect to the Wonderland operating season.

We seriously object to the height and size of these towers.

We expect The City of Vaughan, to refuse permission of these heights in the best interest of the residents living in the area.

Maryam Abbasi

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:04:09 AM

---

**C14**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** Jonathan Virtu [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 4:10 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Hi,

I live in building [REDACTED] Jane Street and I was told you plan on building another two towers by the building I would like to dispute the construction of it as it would take away from my view I already have one view of a building on one side I don't want a view of another building on the other side and then no natural sun light which would make my living experience depressing.

Thank you

**C15**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:04:24 AM

---

**From:** Samantha C [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 4:40 PM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Good Afternoon,

As owners in Bellaria, we have concerns about the 36 story proposal for a condominium to our direct north. We feel that this level of structure is not beneficial to the home environment we have established in Maple.

We are aware that other condos of large stature are going up, which is already disheartening, but the height of which would be built next to us is upsetting. We additionally are extremely concerned about the small amount of space for the proposed building and how this will also impact the comfort of calling Maple home and allowing us to be comfortable with Bellaria as our residence. There is a reason why we established a home in Maple and not in downtown Toronto and it is unfortunate that the public is to have no virtual say in what we call home.

We are happy to have new neighbours but do not like the proposed height and stature of this project as we feel it takes away the comfort of a homey residence. This will only encourage the further obstruction of views and development in this area in the future. We understand the need for condominiums as our financial restraints are a reason why we can only afford a condo in this area, however why can we not make room for neighbours without saturating this city and making it tougher for families who already are here.

This new project would add to the immense amount of traffic that would likely build up here with all these condo projects, it would take away the comforting feeling that this is a residential city and not that of a metropolis and it directly impacts everyone who has been trying to cope with all of the already current adjustments of this area.

We do urge you to consider putting a cap on how high these condos can be built and how this impacts the overall wellbeing of the city as do many other cities and countries.

Kindly,  
Samantha and Christopher

**C16**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:06:39 AM

---

**From:** Joseph Mazzolino <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 17, 2021 9:32 PM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] #1 Solmar MZO Request

Good afternoon, My name is Joseph Mazzolino and I am a resident at Bellaria Tower [REDACTED] Jane Street in Maple ON. I also have investments at Bellaria Tower [REDACTED] Jane Street .I am also a director on the board of Tower no 1 and a director of the shared facilities corporation which looks after all the shared facilities at the Bellaria Complex mentioned below.

I strenuously object to the Minister considering or granting a Ministerial Zoning Order to Solmar which would allow them to build 2 36 Story Towers at 9291 Jane Street.

The area is already congested with high rise towers and we fear that by granting this Zoning Order will create a dangerous situation here on Jane Street. The intersection of Jane St. and Rutherford Ave. are already gridlocked with traffic.

We have great difficulty during rush hour to exit the Bellaris Towers driveway to make a left turn onto Jane st. heading south. Jane St. and Rutherford Ave. will become a jungle of condo towers soon.

Solmar has attempted to convince the residents of 9225, 9235, 9245 and 9255 Jane St. to allow them to use Bellarias land to enter and exit the proposed new tower development mentioned. We are opposed to this as it would create a mess by adding another 900 to 1000 vehicles trying to exit onto Jane Street.

As if that is not enough, what about the infrastructure, sewers etc. to service this additional influx of residents.

Thank you for taking the time to read my views and objections. We hope that not only my objection is heard but that of many other residents here.

I can be reached at [REDACTED] and by email at [REDACTED]

Respectfully  
Joseph Mazzolino



**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Solmar project north of Bellaria Residences  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:43:24 AM

---

---

**From:** Adriana Sinopoli [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 9:28 AM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Solmar project north of Bellaria Residences

Good morning council, on behalf of residents of tower [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Jane St. listed below,  
we are against the building of 2-36 storey condo buildings at 9291Jane St for the following reasons:

- Buildings will be twice the size of the Bellaria towers to the south of this property which will overshadow our buildings
- Traffic will be horrific. With traffic lights or without our roads within our properties will be bottlenecked as there will be traffic from all directions trying to exit and enter. This Solmar project HAS TO HAVE THEIR OWN ENTRANCE AND EXIT FROM THEIR PROPERTY. We do not want to share our roads.
- A fence must be built between the properties for security reasons as our complex has 24 hour security and we do not wish cars entering and using our parking garages and spaces.
- An ENVIROMENTAL STUDY must be done.
- A Density study must be done. Think about the traffic that will occur at the corner of Jane and Rutherford with all the condos going up to the south and north of us.

Thank you

Adriana & Rosetta Sinopoli  
Rosa & Domenic Meleca

Ezia Archese  
Maria Fontes

**C18**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 9:43:51 AM

---

**From:** SouthMapleRatePayers <southmapleratepayers@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 9:38 AM

**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca

**Cc:** Andrew Ruzza [REDACTED]; Babak Jamali <[REDACTED]>; Emilia Rozenblit [REDACTED]; Gerry Sciarra [REDACTED]; Lorenzo Schiavone [REDACTED]; Mario Marmora [REDACTED]; Oleg Radov [REDACTED]; Patricia Marsili [REDACTED]; Peter Budziak [REDACTED]

**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Re: MZO Request from developer asking for Council support of an MZO (Ministerial Zoning Order) for two 36-storey towers at 9291 Jane St.

It has come to our attention that the above request has been brought forward to the City of Vaughan Council for approval.

This email will confirm that the South Maple Ratepayer's Association (SMRPA) strictly oppose the approval of the MZO request. ALL requests should go through the normal public process.

We would also like to state that due to COVID-19 restrictions, public participation in City of Vaughan meetings is beyond limited at this time, ALL requests for development should not be considered in any capacity until full public participation and normal protocol may commence.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Laura Rinaldo  
President, SMRPA

--

Regards,  
Laura Rinaldo  
SMRPA, President

**C19**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] [Newsletter/Marketing] New petition to you: Solmar MZO Request in Vaughan and Public input  
**Date:** January-18-21 10:41:47 AM

---

**From:** Professor Robert Kenedy via Change.org <change@t.change.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 10:32 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] [Newsletter/Marketing] New petition to you: Solmar MZO Request in Vaughan and Public input



## **[clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca), [council@vaughan.ca](mailto:council@vaughan.ca):** **you've been listed as a decision maker**

Professor Robert Kenedy started a petition on Change.org and listed you as a decision maker. Learn more about Professor Robert Kenedy's petition and how you can respond:

Professor Robert Kenedy is petitioning [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca), [council@vaughan.ca](mailto:council@vaughan.ca)

### **[Solmar MZO Request in Vaughan and Public input](#)**

This underhanded approach by deputation to seek Council support for a Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) that precludes public discussion, debate or comment is a clear insult to every taxpayer in the City of Vaughan, as well as to thoughtful council...

[View the petition](#)

#### **WHAT YOU CAN DO**

**1. View the petition:** [Learn about the petition and its supporters](#). You will receive updates as new supporters sign the petition so you can see who is signing and why.

**2. Respond to the petition:** [Post a response](#) to let the petition supporters know you're listening, say whether you agree with their call to action, or ask them for more information.

**3. Continue the dialogue:** Read the comments posted by petition supporters and continue the dialogue so that others can see you're an engaged leader who is willing to participate in open discussion.

#### CHANGE.ORG FOR DECISION MAKERS

On Change.org, decision makers like you connect directly with people around the world to resolve issues. [Learn more](#).

This notification was sent to [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca), the address listed as the decision maker.

[Privacy policy](#)

We'd love to hear from you! [Contact us](#) through our help centre.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993, San Francisco, CA 94104-5401, USA



**DATE:** January 19, 2021  
**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**FROM:** Jim Harnum, City Manager  
**RE:** **Communication - Committee of the Whole (1) January 19, 2021**

**Item No. 9**  
**Anatolia Capital Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.065**  
**8811 Huntington Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Rutherford Road (REFERRED)**

**Item No. 10**  
**Anatolia Capital Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.026, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.066**  
**6560 Langstaff Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Langstaff Road (REFERRED)**

**Item No. 11**  
**Anatolia Investments Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.027, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.067**  
**9151 Huntington Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Rutherford Road (REFERRED)**

---

Council on December 15, 2020 deferred Zoning By-law Amendment Files and Site Development Files Z.18.025 and DA.18.065 (Anatolia Capital Corp.), Z.18.026 and DA.18.066 (Anatolia Capital Corp.), and Z.18.027 and DA.18.067 (Anatolia Investments Corp.) to the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole meeting to allow staff to further review the servicing arrangements as they relate to Block 59.

Since the deferral of the applications staff have worked through the holiday break and into the new year with the Applicant and surrounding landowners to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the sanitary servicing of Blocks 57, 58 and 59. Staff has engaged in several meetings and presented feasible servicing strategy options for the Subject and surrounding lands within Block 59. Staff has also determined capacity is available for all approved and active development applications in Block 59.


The technical report and subsequent Communications considered by Council at previous Committee of the Whole meetings include additional recommendations that the Holding Symbol "(H)" not be removed from the phase 2 portion of the lands until a

complete servicing strategy is developed to the satisfaction of the City that will have no negative impact on Blocks 57/58. In addition, staff will report to future Committee of the Whole once the servicing strategy has been developed, reviewed and approved. At that time, Council will need to make a decision on the related Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications and the Phase 2 Site Plan Applications and Council must enact a By-law to remove the Holding Symbol "(H)" from the Phase 2 portion of the subject lands before any development can proceed on the Phase 2 lands.

In consideration of the above, staff continue to support the recommendations included in the Technical Reports for Zoning By-law Amendment Files and Site Development Files Z.18.025 and DA.18.065 (Anatolia Capital Corp.), Z.18.026 and DA.18.066 (Anatolia Capital Corp.), and Z.18.027 and DA.18.067 (Anatolia Investments Corp.).

For more information, contact, Frank Suppa, Director, Development Engineering ext. 8255 or Mauro Peverini, Acting Chief Planning Official ext. 8407.

Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Harnum", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jim Harnum, City Manager



**DATE:** January 19, 2021  
**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**FROM:** Jim Harnum, City Manager  
**RE:** **Communication - Committee of the Whole (1), January 19, 2021**

**Item No. 9**  
**Anatolia Capital Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.065**  
**8811 Huntington Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Langstaff Road (REFERRED)**

---

## **Recommendations**

That the Recommendations and staff report for Anatolia Capital Corp., Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025 & Site Development File DA.18.065 be amended as follows:

1. That Recommendation 1 be amended as follows:
  - i) be deleted and replaced with the following:

“THAT Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025 (Anatolia Capital Corp.) BE APPROVED to amend Zoning By-law 1-88, to rezone the Subject Lands from “A Agricultural Zone” to “EM1 Prestige Employment Area Zone”, “EM2(H) General Employment Area Zone” with the Holding Symbol “(H)”, and “OS1 Open Space Conservation Zone”, in the manner shown on Attachment 3, together with the site-specific zoning exceptions identified in Table 1 of this report.”
2. That reference to the term “EM1(H) Prestige Employment Area Zone with the Holding Symbol “(H)”” be deleted throughout the report.
3. That Attachment 3 “Proposed Zoning and Site Plan” be replaced the Attachment 3 (affixed hereto as Attachment 1) to remove the Holding Symbol “(H)” from the EM1 Prestige Employment Area Zone.
4. That Recommendation 3 be amended as follows:
  - ii) 3b) be deleted and replaced with the following:



- “3b) All remaining Block 59 conditions of Block Plan approval as they relate to the Block 59 West Landowners.”;
  - iii) 3c) be deleted and replaced with the following:
    - “3c) For the lands zoned EM2(H) General Employment Area Zone with the Holding Symbol “(H)” as shown on Attachment 3 lot consolidation is required with the abutting property to the south”;
  - iv) Adding the following condition:
    - “3d) until a complete servicing strategy is developed to the satisfaction of the City that will have no negative impact on the Blocks 57/58.”
- 5. That reference to the term “Block 59 Landowners Group” and “Block 59 Developer’s Group” be deleted and replaced with “Block 59 West Landowners” throughout the report and in Attachments 1 and 8.
- 6. That Attachment 7 – “Block 59 Land Use Distribution and Landowner Participation” be deleted.

## **Background**

Council on December 1, 2020 and subsequently on December 15, 2020 deferred Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025 and Site Development File DA.18.065 (Anatolia Capital Corp.) to the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole(1) meeting to allow staff the opportunity to respond to Communications respecting these applications. Specifically, the Communications related to the following matters:

- i) Block 59 Plan - Street L

The staff report identifies the final Block 59 Plan has been modified to show Street ‘L’ connecting Line Drive to Highway 27 which was previously shown as “proposed”. This change reflects the Traffic and Transportation Study update (October 2020) which includes Street ‘L’ as part of the transportation network and has been approved to the satisfaction of York Region and the City of Vaughan. A landowner submitted a Communication regarding their desire to delete Street L from the Block 59 Plan.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010, Volume 2, Section 11.9 West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan includes policy 2.2.8 c.) which provides for the following:

“A request to delete a road or portion thereof must be accompanied by a comprehensive transportation study being completed to the satisfaction of the City and the Region. The transportation study must include, among other things, an assessment of the effects of such change on the surrounding local and regional road network to ensure that there are no negative impacts resulting on the development and functioning of the surrounding lands.”

This policy in the Official Plan provides a clear process for staff to consider the deletion of Street L. Staff will review a request from the landowner(s) to delete Street L upon submission of a transportation study to support the request, to the satisfaction of the City.

ii) References to Block 59

The staff report includes references to servicing arrangements as they relate to Block 59. The intent in the staff report is that all costs for Phase 1 infrastructure requirements be borne by the Block 59 West landowners. Accordingly, a Recommendation is included to reflect this intent.

iii) Servicing for Blocks 57/58

The proposed phase 2 of the development utilizes an interim servicing strategy which will convey flows to the Huntington trunk sewer. The landowners in Block 57/58 have expressed concerns that the additional flows from the interim strategy will result in capacity constraints in Blocks 57/58.

In consideration of the above, Staff recommends Condition 3b) be amended to add an additional condition to remove the Holding Symbol “(H)” subject to a complete servicing strategy to be developed to the satisfaction of the City to demonstrate there will be no negative impacts on the ability to service future development in Blocks 57/58.

iv) Revision to the Holding Symbol condition related to lot consolidation requirement

The Recommendation includes a condition for the removal of Holding Symbol from the lands zoned EM1(H) Prestige Employment Area Zone and EM2(H) General Employment Area Zone each with the Holding Symbol “(H)” to require lot consolidation with the abutting property to the south. The Owner has requested the parcel zoned EM1(H) Prestige Employment Area Zone with the Holding Symbol “(H)” abutting the property to the south be excluded from this requirement as the parcel complies with the minimum lot size requirements of Zoning By-law 1-88 and can be developed independently. Accordingly, reference to the EM1 Prestige Employment Area Zone in this condition can be deleted. Staff has no objection to this request.

v) Removal of the Holding Symbol from the lands zoned EM1 (Block 2)

The Owner has requested revisions to Recommendation 1 in the staff report for Anatolia Capital Corp., Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.025 and Site Development File DA.18.065 to remove the Holding Symbol “(H)” for the parcel identified as Block 2 in Attachment 9.

Staff can support this request as the parcel is located in the Phase 1 development of the Subject Lands and can be serviced and accessed from Huntington Road in the same manner as the parcel identified as Block 1 in Attachment 9. The Holding Symbol “(H)”


would still apply to all lands to be zoned "EM2 General Employment Zone (Phase 2). The Owner must also submit a Site Development Application before this Block can be developed.

For more information, contact, Frank Suppa, Director, Development Engineering ext. 8255.



Attachment


Attachment 1: Attachment 3, Proposed Zoning and Site Plan


Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Harnum". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Jim Harnum, City Manager



 Subject Lands	EM1(H), Prestige Employment Area Zone with the Holding Symbol	EM2(H), General Employment Area Zone with the Holding Symbol
	EM1, Prestige Employment Area Zone	OS1, Open Space Conservation Zone



# Proposed Zoning and Site Plan

**LOCATION:** Part of Lot 13, Concession 9;  
8811 Huntington Road

**APPLICANT:** Anatolia Capital Corp.



# Attachment

# 3

**FILES:** Z.18.025 and DA.18.065  
**RELATED FILE:** 19T-18V009

**DATE:** January 19, 2021



**DATE:** January 19, 2021  
**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**FROM:** Jim Harnum, City Manager  
**RE:** **Communication - Committee of the Whole (1) January 19, 2021**

**Item No. 10**  
**Anatolia Capital Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.026, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.066**  
**6560 Langstaff Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Langstaff Road (REFERRED)**

---

## **Recommendations**

That the Recommendations and staff report for Anatolia Capital Corp., Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.026 & Site Development File DA.18.066 be amended as follows:

1. That Recommendation 3 be amended as follows:
  - i) 3b) be deleted and replaced with the following:

“3b) All remaining Block 59 conditions of Block Plan approval as they relate to the Block 59 West Landowners.”;
2. That reference to the term “Block 59 Landowners Group” and “Block 59 Developer’s Group” be deleted and replaced with “Block 59 West Landowners” throughout the report and in Attachments 1 and 9.
3. That Attachment 8 – “Block 59 Land Use Distribution and Landowner Participation” be deleted.

## **Background**

Council on December 1, 2020 and subsequently on December 15, 2020 deferred Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.026 and Site Development File DA.18.066 (Anatolia Capital Corp.) to the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole (1) meeting to allow staff the opportunity to respond to Communications respecting these applications. Specifically, the Communications related to the following matters:

- i) Block 59 Plan - Street L

The staff report identifies the final Block 59 Plan has been modified to show Street 'L' connecting Line Drive to Highway 27 which was previously shown as "proposed". This change reflects the Traffic and Transportation Study update (October 2020) which includes Street 'L' as part of the transportation network and has been approved to the satisfaction of York Region and the City of Vaughan. A landowner submitted a Communication regarding their desire to delete Street L from the Block 59 Plan.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010, Volume 2, Section 11.9 West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan includes policy 2.2.8 c.) which provides for the following:

"A request to delete a road or portion thereof must be accompanied by a comprehensive transportation study being completed to the satisfaction of the City and the Region. The transportation study must include, among other things, an assessment of the effects of such change on the surrounding local and regional road network to ensure that there are no negative impacts resulting on the development and functioning of the surrounding lands."


This policy in the Official Plan provides a clear process for staff to consider the deletion of Street L. Staff will review a request from the landowner(s) to delete Street L upon submission of a transportation study to support the request, to the satisfaction of the City.

ii) Reference to Block 59

The staff report includes references to servicing arrangements as they relate to Block 59. The intent in the staff report is that all costs for all Phase 1 infrastructure requirements be borne by the Block 59 West landowners. Accordingly, a Recommendation is included to reflect this intent.

For more information, contact, Frank Suppa, Director, Development Engineering ext. 8255.

Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Harnum". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Jim Harnum, City Manager



**DATE:** January 19, 2021  
**TO:** Mayor and Members of Council  
**FROM:** Jim Harnum, City Manager  
**RE:** **Communication - Committee of the Whole (1) January 19, 2021**

**Item No. 11**  
**Anatolia Investments Corp.**  
**Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.027, Site Development File**  
**DA.18.067**  
**9151 Huntington Road**  
**Vicinity of Huntington Road and Rutherford Road (REFERRED)**

---

## **Recommendations**

That the Recommendations and staff report for Anatolia Investments Corp., Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.027 & Site Development File DA.18.067 be amended as follows:

1. That Recommendation 2 be amended as follows:
  - i) 2b) be deleted and replaced with the following:

“2b) All remaining Block 59 conditions of Block Plan approval as they relate to the Block 59 West Landowners.”;
  - ii) Adding the following condition:

“2c) until a complete servicing strategy is developed to the satisfaction of the City that will have no negative impact on the Blocks 57/58.”
2. That reference to the term “Block 59 Landowners Group” and “Block 59 Developer’s Group” be deleted and replaced with “Block 59 West Landowners” throughout the report and in Attachments 1 and 8.
3. That Attachment 7 – “Block 59 Land Use Distribution and Landowner Participation” be deleted.

## **Background**

Council on December 1, 2020 and subsequently on December 15, 2020 deferred Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.18.027 and Site Development File DA.18.067 (Anatolia Investment Corp.) to the January 19, 2021 Committee of the Whole (1)

meeting to allow staff the opportunity to respond to Communications respecting these applications. Specifically, the Communications related to the following matters:

i) Block 59 Plan - Street L

The staff report identifies the final Block 59 Plan has been modified to show Street 'L' connecting Line Drive to Highway 27 which was previously shown as "proposed". This change reflects the Traffic and Transportation Study update (October 2020) which includes Street 'L' as part of the transportation network and has been approved to the satisfaction of York Region and the City of Vaughan. A landowner submitted a Communication regarding their desire to delete Street L from the Block 59 Plan.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010, Volume 2, Section 11.9 West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan includes policy 2.2.8 c.) which provides for the following:

"A request to delete a road or portion thereof must be accompanied by a comprehensive transportation study being completed to the satisfaction of the City and the Region. The transportation study must include, among other things, an assessment of the effects of such change on the surrounding local and regional road network to ensure that there are no negative impacts resulting on the development and functioning of the surrounding lands."


This policy in the Official Plan provides a clear process for staff to consider the deletion of Street L. Staff will review a request from the landowner(s) to delete Street L upon submission of a transportation study to support the request, to the satisfaction of the City.

ii) Reference to Block 59

The staff report includes references to servicing arrangements as they relate to Block 59. The intent in the staff report is that all costs for Phase 1 infrastructure requirements be borne by the Block 59 West landowners. Accordingly, a Recommendation is included to reflect this intent.

For more information, contact, Frank Suppa, Director, Development Engineering ext. 8255.

Respectfully submitted by,



Jim Harnum, City Manager



**C24**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Communication Item 5(1) Committee of the Whole Meeting Jan 19, 2020 1pm  
**Date:** January-18-21 11:08:51 AM  
**Attachments:** [Vaughan Council Letter Re 19Jan20 CofW Mtng Item 5\(1\) \(1\).pdf](#)

---

**From:** IRENE FORD [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 11:07 AM  
**To:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** [External] Communication Item 5(1) Committee of the Whole Meeting Jan 19, 2020 1pm

City Clerks,

Please find attached a letter to be added to as a communication to Item 5.(1) on the Committee of the Wholes meeting January 19, 2020 at 1pm: [PRESENTATIONS - Committee of the Whole \(1\) - January 19, 2021](#)

**PRESENTATIONS - Committee of the Whole (1) -  
January 19, 2021**

Thank you,  
Irene Zeppieri

Irene Zeppieri  
Irish Moss Crt.,  
Vaughan, ON

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

Jan 18, 2020

**Re: Item 5 (1) Committee of the Whole Agenda January 19, 2020, 1p.m. and Endorsement of Developer Minister's Zoning Order Requests**

**Dear Honourable Mayor, Regional Councillors and Councillors:**

I am writing today to express continued concern about endorsement of previous developer Minister's Zoning Order (MZO) requests, the MZO request before you today and all others that may come. To date I have found that Vaughan Council has endorsed seven (7) MZO developer requests and five (5) have been approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. A recent York Region news article stated that the City of Vaughan approved \$1 billion in development projects in 2020 and that City building has not slowed in the City of Vaughan during the global pandemic<sup>1</sup>. Presumably most of this development was approved through the status quo planning process. The staff report entitled *Active Development Applications - Update*<sup>2</sup> references a study completed by BILD stating that Vaughan's planning process performs well. It is ranked 1st for Site Plan Approval and 2nd for Official Plan and Zoning Amendments and Subdivision Plan Approval when compared to 18 municipalities of similar size. This would suggest that Vaughan Council should only need to endorse a MZO under exceptional circumstances otherwise the planning process is efficient.

The developer request before you today does not justify or provide sufficient rationale on why Vaughan Council should endorse the MZO at the expense of public consultation and appeal rights, circumvent the local planning process and prioritize this developer's application, ahead of all other active applications that followed and abided by the local planning process (481 are active as of Nov 30, 2020).

---

<sup>1</sup> Vaughan's economy expected to recover in 2021 but environmental, social issues continue  
<https://www.yorkregion.com/news-story/10298703-vaughan-s-economy-expected-to-recover-in-2021-but-environmental-social-issues-continue/>

<sup>2</sup> City of Vaughan Staff Report entitled "Active Development Applications-Update", Deputy City Manager, Infrastructure Development, Jan 19, 2020:  
<https://pub-vaughan.escrimemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=8c109899-aba8-4e42-a2c7-13d92e212692&Agenda=Agenda&lang=English&Item=27>

A previous MZO endorsed<sup>3</sup> and approved<sup>4</sup> is on the south east corner of Jane and Rutherford for multiple condominium buildings up to 30 stories. The request before Vaughan Council today is on the north east corner of Jane and Rutherford and is requesting zoning changes to proceed with two (2) condominium buildings *at the same major intersection*<sup>5</sup>. The developer indicates that this will speed up the process by 24 months. It is unclear if this is consistent with City of Vaughan and York Region infrastructure plans and timelines. Especially in the context of the already approved MZO at the same intersection. It would be rash for Vaughan Council to endorse this development request in the absence of a greater understanding of approved and active development applications and the adequacy or inadequacy of infrastructure (water, wastewater, roads, transit etc.). At a minimum I would suspect staff need time to review this application in the context of Vaughan's Asset Management Policy<sup>6</sup>. This information would enable a full understanding of conditions external yet pertinent to the proposed development.

More specifically is the MZO request consistent with the approved Vaughan Mills Center Secondary Plan (VMCSP)<sup>7</sup>; the request shows building heights of 36 stories but Schedule B of the VMCSP shows maximum building heights of 25 and 22 stories? **Is Vaughan Council also being asked to endorse a greater building height than what was publicly consulted and approved?** I am unable to find the previously approved MZO referred to by the developer under the approved Planning Act regulations, is it still active and why was it needed? If this phase of the project truly had a significant planning hurdle that required zoning changes why was it not addressed at that time and included in the previously approved MZO?

It would appear that special treatment of MZO endorsed applications follows in subsequent City and Regional permit and planning approvals. This is unfair to all other active development applications. As an example the MZO endorsed by Vaughan Council<sup>8</sup> and approved by the

---

<sup>3</sup> Mayor Bevilacqua's Members Resolution entitled: "Request from Cortel Group on behalf of Rutherford Land Development Corporation and Caldari Land Development Corporation for a Minister's Zoning Order to Zone 2901 Rutherford Road and Part of Lot 15, Concession 4 (VGN), designated as Parts 3, 4, 9 and 10, Plan 65R-34051, located at the Southeast Corner of Jane Street and Rutherford Road, in the City of Vaughan" Oct 21, 2020: <https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=51493>

<sup>4</sup> O.Reg. 643/20: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/200643>

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Rino Mostacci, on behalf of Solmar Development Corp., with respect to Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) for Park Avenue Place Phase 2, (9095 Jane St.) and for Bellaria II (9291 Jane St.) and request favourable consideration from City Council to adopt the requisite resolutions.

<https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=57252>

<sup>6</sup> City of Vaughan Asset Management Policy:

<https://www.vaughan.ca/cityhall/departments/IPCAM/policies/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>7</sup> Decision Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan for all lands east of Hwy 400 not under appeal, See pg. 105: [https://www.vaughan.ca/projects/policy\\_planning\\_projects/official\\_planning\\_2010/General%20Documents/VOP%202020%20Board%20Orders%20and%20Decisions/PL140839-NOV-04-2020.pdf](https://www.vaughan.ca/projects/policy_planning_projects/official_planning_2010/General%20Documents/VOP%202020%20Board%20Orders%20and%20Decisions/PL140839-NOV-04-2020.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Mayor Bevilacqua's Members Resolution entitled: "REQUEST FROM CONMAR DEVELOPMENTS INC. & FENLANDS VAUGHAN INC., DG GROUP AND LORWOOD HOLDINGS FOR MINISTER'S ZONING ORDER FOR THE DECLASSIFICATION OF PROVINCIALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS IN BLOCK 34 EAST" Mar 9, 2020: <https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=30449>

Minister of MHMA<sup>9</sup> for the Walmart Warehouse distribution facility<sup>10</sup> had a site plan approved dependent on numerous conditions being fulfilled<sup>11</sup>. The development broke ground in August<sup>12</sup>. It remains unclear to me if all conditions of approval have been met. In this instance provincial approval of the MZO was required to declassify, destroy and relocate provincially significant wetlands in conjunction with a permit under Ontario's Endangered Species Act to allow endangered species habitat alteration<sup>13</sup>. Only four (4) Ha of agricultural land was the subject of provincial approval for the MZO; all other zoning changes were promptly approved by Vaughan Council<sup>14</sup>. While this development may appear to bring large economic benefits it will also come with hidden externalized costs borne by taxpayers; no/inadequate infrastructure, creation of significant trailer traffic that will result in increased pollution and public health burden, traffic congestion, increased wear and tear on roads and more. These impacts will be experienced by the community long after the financial benefits of the development have been realized. It will also decrease Vaughan's ability to be climate resilient by paving over a site that had potential for natural heritage extension, offering natural free stormwater and source water protection - Natural Asset Management<sup>15</sup>.

At present the only justification observed for endorsement of MZO developer requests ahead of all other development applications is that a developer asked and their request subsequently appeared on Vaughan Council's agenda. The rationale for Vaughan Council endorsement of MZO developer requests must be stronger than vague references to affordable housing and economic recovery from COVID-19. The affordable housing crisis will not be solved by offering a few units here and there through ad hoc approval with unclear requirements about the type and size of the units (for families, individuals). It may solve the problem if we are trying to create affordable housing for Vaughan Councillor's children but little more. The reality is that there are greater structural barriers that need to be understood and included in the solution if Vaughan Council truly wants to provide affordable housing (which should also include rental housing). I look forward to reading the staff report that was requested by Vaughan Council last December.

---

<sup>9</sup> O. Reg. 173/20: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/200173>

<sup>10</sup> 11110 Jane St., North of Jane and Teston, just south of the end of the proposed GTA West Corridor/Highway 413.

<sup>11</sup> CONMAR DEVELOPMENTS INC. & FENLANDS VAUGHAN INC. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.19.007 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-19V002 SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.19.072 11110 JANE STREET <https://pub-vaughan.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=31936>

<sup>12</sup> Walmart Canada and Condor Properties Break Ground on Newest and Highest Volume Distribution Centre in Vaughan:

<https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/walmart-canada-and-condor-properties-break-ground-on-newest-and-highest-volume-distribution-centre-in-vaughan-868896194.html>

<sup>13</sup> <https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-1685> and <https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-1069>

<sup>14</sup> CONMAR DEVELOPMENTS INC. & FENLANDS VAUGHAN INC. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.19.007 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-19V002 SITE DEVELOPMENT FILE DA.19.072 11110 JANE STREET, Apr 21, 2020:

<https://pub-vaughan.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=31936>

<sup>15</sup> Investments in Natural Infrastructure Have Significant Economic Returns: Report Jun 4, 2020:

<https://www.watercanada.net/investments-in-natural-infrastructure-have-significant-economic-returns-report/>

Economic recovery from COVID-19 must embrace all ten (10) of Vaughan's Strategic Priorities, not just the economic ones. Vaughan Council declared a Climate Emergency in June of 2019<sup>16</sup> that recognized the urgency and need for all levels of government to act. This reality and urgency to act must be better reflected in Council decisions that affect the economy and development; especially those that are subject to special treatment through endorsement of MZO developer requests.

I once again ask Vaughan Council to refrain from endorsing MZO developer requests unless there are extreme circumstances that are explained to the public in an open, transparent, rational and justified manner. Endorsement of MZO requests should be in the greater public interest and contribute to supporting all ten of Vaughan's Strategic Priorities. As an observer of this process it is difficult to see how Vaughan Council is representing their constituents and the public interest by endorsing development projects that clearly have unresolved conflicts, many with a long documented history. **There is no red tape or duplication of process; there are conflicts with how the developer wants to develop on the land they own versus what is permitted by current planning documents/legislation and acceptable to surrounding communities/constituents as approved through Vaughan's Official Plan.**

I look forward to seeing concerns of public interest, your constituents, fully reflected in Vaughan Council decision making. Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,  
Irene Zeppieri

---

<sup>16</sup> City of Vaughan declared Climate Emergency:  
[https://www.vaughan.ca/cityhall/environmental\\_sustainability/Pages/Climate-Change.aspx](https://www.vaughan.ca/cityhall/environmental_sustainability/Pages/Climate-Change.aspx)

**C25**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 11:22:20 AM

---

---

**From:** Connie Mucci [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 11:17 AM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of [REDACTED] Jane St. I have been a resident of Maple since 1987, and have therefore, seen many changes in our small, growing, and constantly evolving community. I am most distressed at the current MZO Request being submitted by Solmar. This flies in the face of all of the environmental issues dealt with by the Maple community. To request permission to circumvent environmental controls is unfathomable. Maple was granted the North Maple Regional Park, in part, to compensate the community for tolerating being home to North America's largest garbage dump/land fill for so many years. Please DO NOT grant the MZO Request. If the past year, fraught with COVID and frightening environmental changes, climate related and otherwise, has taught us nothing else, it should have taught us to respect our planet, and our immediate environment.

Further to this, the application for two towers, double the height of the existing four towers is unreasonable. It will add to congestion, which is already a problem in the Jane and Rutherford/Major Mackenzie area. We are already inundated with traffic, which will only be amplified, between Vaughan Mills mall, Wonderland, the existing condo towers, and the condo towers already approved, and in progress.

Further to the traffic problem, I think that the new proposed complex, at double the height of the existing four towers will look hideous. How does it make sense to have such tall structures dwarfing the existing towers? And, it is my understanding that Solmar is attempting to use our gatehouse to enter or exit the new development. The lineup to enter our property, under normal conditions, COVID aside, can already be too long, as my visitors have reported. Allowing the new complex access to our gatehouse will compound an already excessive traffic problem. In my opinion, the tall towers should be restricted to the Highway 7 corridor.

Thank you for taking the time to read about my concerns. I hope that you will consider the environmental impact above all else, and refuse this MZO Request.

Connie Mucci  
[REDACTED] Jane St  
[REDACTED]  
Maple, ON

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Connie Mucci**

Sent from my iPad

**C26**  
**Communication**  
**CW (1) – January 19, 2021**  
**Item # - Presentation #1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Bellisario, Adelina](mailto:Bellisario, Adelina)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request  
**Date:** January-18-21 11:32:04 AM

---

---

**From:** Andrew Bruno [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Monday, January 18, 2021 11:31 AM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Presentation #1 Solmar MZO Request

Hello Councillors,

As a resident of the Bellaria by Solmar it was brought to our attention that Solmar is planning two 36 storey towers at 9291 Jane street.

I'd like to vote no for the approval of this property.

Wishing all the best in these times.

Cheers,  
Andrew