

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Jacquelyn Gillis](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Item 3 -1, for Tuesday public committee of the whole -Nov 22, 2022  
**Date:** Monday, November 21, 2022 10:52:13 AM

---

---

**From:** Mackenzie Ridge Rate Payers Association <mackenzieridgerpa@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 20, 2022 8:51 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Mackenzie Ridge Rate Payers Association <mackenzieridgerpa@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** [External] Item 3 -1, for Tuesday public committee of the whole -Nov 22, 2022

We support the following put forth by Alexandra Ney.

Official Plan Amendment File OP.22.013  
Zoning By-law Amendment File Z.22.024  
4130 King Vaughan Road

The owner is seeking to permit a mineral aggregate storage and distribution operation with accessory office etc. If this zone does not permit the uses the Owner is seeking, why would you make amendments to permit the operation? If your permitted uses clearly state outside storage and distribution of mineral aggregates with an accessory office within an existing dwelling is not permitted in agricultural zone?

**We are against approval to permit existing mineral aggregate storage and distribution operation, and amendments to the Vaughan Official Plan Zoning By-law 1-88, and 001-2021.**

The impact of this sites daily continuous trucking past us – noise, vibration, dirt, dust, exhaust is tremendous. Trucks pull off idling along the roadside or are seen lined up waiting to enter the site. **To this end we ask:**

1) From December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022 onward, that all trucks enter and exit the subject lands only from the West of 4130 King Vaughan Road. Regional Councillors – correct me if I'm wrong, they have a Regional Road permit to Weston Road only. By observation, they are not compliant, as trucks are travelling east on King Vaughan Road towards Jane Street. The Staff report sites, trucks leave and approach the subject lands from east on King Vaughan Rd, then turn south along Weston Road, and east-west roads in Vaughan to access Highway 400. How do you protect the residents in King, as multitudes of trucks run up and down through Laskay on Weston Road, where children live and play? All the trucks impact Vaughan area and surrounding municipalities. How do elderly safely walk east of Weston Road on King Vaughan Road, with huge trucks quickly travelling on the narrow roads? There are bicyclists using King

Vaughan Road. The speed limit by our home and to the west along King Vaughan Road is 60km/hr, could loaded aggregate trucks brake in time if someone stumbles, or a child runs after a ball into the road?

2) We ask for the Mayor, Councillors and the Region to request York Regional Police to make a presence on King Vaughan Road and strictly enforce the traffic act, road postings, and any road usage permits. Should road safety for us as residents and all drivers of this narrow 2 lane road not be a priority and a mandate of York Region, the City of Vaughan and York Region Police? Is it not true City Staff also enforce some regulations of the Regional Municipality of York, such as the Parking and Stopping on Regional Roads By-laws? Why is this not happening on King Vaughan Road?

3) Please ensure the year-round weight restrictions from Pine Valley to Jane Street and or Bathurst, are kept in place and enforced on King Vaughan Road. Keep all truck advisory's in place. How much is this costing tax payers to maintain roads for all this heavy loaded truck traffic? How dangerous (road safety) for all these trucks to be mixing with the residential traffic? The road is a hilly terrain, with areas of poor site lines. If trucks park on the narrow road waiting to enter, how will drivers see past on the hill for oncoming traffic, when attempting to pass? I've heard it stated (paraphrasing), at other committee meeting discussions, commercial and residential traffic do not mix. Why would it be considered okay in this area?

4) In the Staff report highlights Page 1 - the technical report that is to be prepared for a Committee of the Whole Meeting, should be within 6 months.

#### **Questions arising from the Planning Justification Report:**

Planning Justification report, extract from the Introduction states, the existing use of the Subject Land for the outside storage of mineral aggregates is not a permitted uses in the Agricultural designation and zone in accordance with the City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010. Page 14, they state, that the scale, function, and activity of the use has not changed on the Subject Lands since at least 2009.

When was the earth berm installed? Were applications of permit required for the berm? Why are there more and more trucks daily/yearly? Why does it appear to be more area taken up with aggregate if it has not changed in scale?? Why do we hear loud banging noises from the direction of the Subject Lands? Why are trucks seen lining up along the narrow 2 lane road waiting to enter the site, if it has not increased in scale? Why does it appear to be higher and higher piles of aggregate? What year was this data based on? How was this statement conclusion arrived at?

Page 14 – The use has integrated within the rural landscape and there are no anticipated impacts related to noise, vibration, fumes, smoke, dust, odours, lighting and traffic generating

capacity resulting from the outdoor aggregate storage use. Why are we as residents not considered? We are heavily impacted on 4 fronts, as our home sits on the corner, just a few feet from the road. How was this conclusion reached? What impact studies and assessments were done to support this statement? Please provide the materials so that we can see how residents were acknowledged, to arrive at this conclusion.

Page 10 – Provincial Policy heading, I question – is this not a stretch to include shipped in aggregate? It is not a naturally occurring mineral in the area, this is not an extraction quarry. What written information have you received, if any, from the Ministry of Natural Resources regarding the submitted planning justification materials? Page 13 calls it a small-scale temporary storage area. What is their definition of temporary? What is considered Small Scale?

Page 7 comments on the truck traffic volume. **What year did their trucking numbers come from?** What is observed daily is vastly different to the numbers provided? How did they arrive at these truck numbers? How environmentally sustainable and efficient is the tremendous daily truck traffic?

One set of trucks make deliveries; a completely different amount of trucks enters and exit removing product from subject lands. This is an impactful operation on the area and residents.

What is the cost to tax payers for the costly up keep of road infrastructure? The cost of daily impact on residents and environment? The cost for enforcement? The cost of by-law enforcement? The cost of By-law Staff time?

### **Cost Savings?**

How can shipping in product from far off aggregate quarry pits to be dumped at 4130 King Vaughan Rod, then reloaded be considered cost savings? Would it not add to the cost? With all due respect is this not the basis of business to make money?

**Page 7 – of planning justification, states Hours of operation- 7:30 am to 4:30 pm on weekdays?** What year did these hours apply too? What does this reference –office hours as compared to trucking hours? The hours of trucks moving in and out, vastly differ from the stated hours!

**Page 13 – #3 Subject to the policies in Section 4, development outside of settlement areas may be permitted on rural lands for.....**

This is a rural area, I'm sure you are also aware there are residential homes all along the road including agricultural lands. We again, are hugely impacted on four road frontages by all the trucks – noise, fumes, vibration, dirt and dust, lighting, honking, braking etc.

Why do residents not count? Are we to all move? Which is an ironic question to ask, when there is demand to build more homes, and is it not a part of this operations/subject lands justification to have materials for home building?

### **Staff report questions?**

**The owners of the subject lands have been issued notices to comply from By-law and Compliance, Licensing and Permit Services.** Reading through this section, notices to comply, failing to do so, legal action, court proceedings, fines. Why would you find this the type of business suitable for this area?

- How many complaints have been received by residents, directly to by-law or through the Councillors office? How many complaints to Regional Staff and Regional Councillors?
- Why have they not applied earlier, or been compliant for all these years? Is this the type of operation you want in this area?

“since at least 2009” per planning justification report. With all due respect, how can there be any appropriateness of amendments to zoning by-laws and site specific exceptions after reading this application, Staff Report, and By-law history? **The Staff report seems to indicate the operation has not been permitted for many reasons. Why would you allow it now?**

I ask the Mayor, Councillors and York Region Councillors to please consider my questions, and 4 requests. To please ensure the year-round weight restrictions from Pine Valley to Jane Street and or Bathurst, are kept in place and enforced on King Vaughan Road. Keeping all truck advisory's in place. To work with the Region to mandate all trucks enter and exit the site to and from the West of the subject lands, and be enforced.

Alexandra Ney,

Resident of King Vaughan Road  
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