

Communication : C 9
Committee of the Whole (1)
June 7, 2022
Agenda Item # 20

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

From: alexandra ney [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2022 10:45 AM
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Subject: [External] 2109179 Ontario Inc

Hello,

Please find my attached letter for Tuesday June 7th, 2022 1:00pm, Committee of the Whole (1) meeting,

#6 Item 20

2109179 Ontario Inc. Zoning by-law amendment (Temporary Use) File Z.20.018 Site Development File DA.20.029
3501 King-Vaughan Road Vicinity of King-Vaughan Road and Highway 400 (Referred)

Kind regards,
Alexandra

June 7th, 2022

Item 6 - 20, 2109179 Ontario Inc. Zoning By-law Amendment (Temporary Use) File Z.20.018 Site Development File DA.20.029 3501 King- Vaughan Road Vicinity of King-Vaughan Road and Highway 400 (Referred)

Mayor, Regional Councillors and Councillors

I once again ask Council to oppose the extension of temporary permit for 1 year and to say no to the concrete crushing on site. If Council feels it must give the 1 year temporary permit, please ensure this is it. I've spoken and written letters many times, are you listening? I understand the complexity of this situation, and would like to say, while I respect all Staff and Council. Following my deputation, during discussions, something about 35 employees, who may live locally was mentioned. We do reside locally in Vaughan – we deserve to enjoy our home – have you considered anything I've said and asked for? What do we need to do to be heard and considered? If the Company had chosen a piece of land that conformed with Vaughan Official Plan 2010, that allowed this type of operation, we would not be here. Is this your loop hole in your planning, and by-laws that allows the land usage for which it was never intended?

Would it not be a better planning process to involve Residents input, before Company's develop their site? It seems we only get to speak after a company has developed their site and been operating for many years. Does this seem fair or most beneficial way to grow your employment area? Should the Municipality not strive to have the peripheral boundary area as nice as the interior area, mitigating any conflict?

In the Staff Report Page 1 contained in the first paragraph – The Owner has applied to permit the continued use of one (1) existing portable dry batch concrete production plant, the introduction of a second portable concrete batching plant and the increased storage along with production and processing of recycled concrete..... *Will this all equates to more potential noise, dust, air pollution and truck traffic? What year did the crushing operation begin (processing of recycled concrete)? Did the operator consult with you? Is it an allowed usage for the zoning, as I understand the municipality has land jurisdiction?*

Page 2 – Report Highlights – bullet point #5 – The development planning department does not support the proposed expansion of an additional concrete batching plant, the increase in production nor the potential renewal of one (1) additional year beyond May 23, 2023. *How do you monitor production, thereby knowing the capacity has not gone over the annual limit? Is there a second portable concrete batching plant on site, if so what happens to it? What assurances can you give to Residents? Has the Planning Staff been out to view the site?*

Page 17 - The Applications are not consistent with the general intent to VOP 2010 for the following reasons: followed by 4 bullet points;

- **Second bullet point** - The Applications represent the third temporary use renewal for an operation that has been in existence for over 12 years, which is not considered “temporary”

What does this mean? If another temporary permit is approved, is the site now permanent?

Page 23 of the Staff Report, Water Distribution – Water servicing is existing for the Subject Lands via a private domestic well to service the Development.

When was the well put in? How much water is used daily? Residents in the area are dependent on private wells, will this potentially affect us?

Attachment 1 – Conditions of Site Plan Approval

***Hours of operation** - mentioned under 2. b) - *are not at all clear to me, what are the hours? How will you enforce them; can you enforce them? Could the business hours be defined?*

***Crushing operation**, *was this a permitted land use? Was this mentioned in the OMB decision? If not, why would it be included in the “Conditions of Site Plan Approval”? C) i) and ii)? I’m asking you to say no to this crushing operation. When did this land, use begin? How frequently does it occur? How much potential noise, dust and truck traffic will this process create?*

Do I remember correctly; it was suggested at the May 10th meeting a Surety be collected and Penalty system be recommended? If so, will this be added into the Conditions of Site Plan Approval?

What conditions can be given to ensure/enforce compliance such as adhering to the YR road usage permit for all trucks to enter and exit the site via Jane Street? As Residents, if we read that Staff and the DCM of Planning and Growth Management, working with York Region gave assurance in the Site Conditions, with a method to enforce; there would be a much better Business/Residential balance.

I’m once again asking you to 1) oppose the extension of temporary permit for 1 year and 2) to say no to concrete crushing on site. If Council feels it must give the 1 year temporary permit, please ensure this is it.

Alexandra Ney,
Resident of King Vaughan Road