

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Jacquelyn Gillis](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Fwd: Rio Can - Public Meeting Tuesday  
**Date:** Monday, December 5, 2022 1:57:27 PM

---

---

**From:** Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2022 1:54 PM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** DevelopmentPlanning@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Fwd: Rio Can - Public Meeting Tuesday

---

**From:** Irene Zeppieri <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 5, 2022 1:16 PM  
**To:** [Council@vaughan.ca](mailto:Council@vaughan.ca)  
**Cc:** [francesco.sorbara@parl.gc.ca](mailto:francesco.sorbara@parl.gc.ca); [omar.alghabra@parl.gc.ca](mailto:omar.alghabra@parl.gc.ca); Paul Freeman  
<[REDACTED]>; Wayne Emmerson <[REDACTED]>; Sandra Malcic  
<[REDACTED]>; [landuse@navcanada.ca](mailto:landuse@navcanada.ca); [landuse.planning@gtaa.com](mailto:landuse.planning@gtaa.com)  
**Subject:** [External] Fwd: Rio Can - Public Meeting Tuesday

Hello,

I am unable to attend in person but shared my concerns below. I ran out of time and expanded below on some concerns.

Should noise studies be done that consider aviation noise from planes, then they should note wind conditions, which dictate if planes are arriving or departing and be done reflecting both. At night as well due to the preferred runway system implemented. Although Vaughan might not be 'preferred' we are the third choice and if my understanding of the data is correct take an almost equivalent amount of night time flights over residential as the 'preferred' routes.

I have expressed concerns to GTAA, NavCan, Transport Canada and my MP about impacts that existing buildings in the VMC may have had on Pearson's operations. Resulting in increased departure and arrival traffic being shifted over existing low-rise residential. Not impacts to flight paths which require approval from Transport Canada, but day to day operations. NavCan is a commenting agency & has no authority to approve or deny applications but are required to be consulted on certain applications. Municipalities are the ultimate land use authority. NavCan has reviewed applications in the VMC. I have been unable to confirm if they did or did not express concerns or even object to existing or proposed buildings. They directed me to follow up directly with the municipality, which I have not done to date.

I am requesting more transparency about communications and consultation on land use decisions in which consultation with NavCan is a component. This should be a component of the public

consultation and clearly identified in the required planning studies, as well as staff reports to Council.

I have not reviewed but wonder if this a component in the Weston 7 Secondary Plan? It may influence building heights and residential development patterns particularly on the SW side of highway 400, which I suspect is more affected by Pearson's operations.

Thank you,  
Irene

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** IRENE FORD <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** December 5, 2022 at 12:01:40 PM EST  
**To:** [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**Subject:** Rio Can - Public Meeting Tuesday

Vaughan Council and Planning Staff,

Below are my comments and concerns with regard to the following development application: RIOCAN REAL ESTATE INV TRUST OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILES OP.22.002 & OP.22.005 3555 HIGHWAY 7, 7501, 7575, 7601 & 7621 WESTON ROAD, 10, 11, 20, 21, 30, 31, 40, 41, 55 & 67 COLOSSUS DRIVE AND 16, 21, 30 & 31 FAMOUS ROAD VICINITY OF HIGHWAY 7 AND WESTON RD.

### **Planes & Airport Noise**

I have lived in Vaughan since 2009 and there has been a steady increase in plane traffic over my community. Over the summer it was intolerable due to runway construction at Pearson. It has improved greatly in recent months but there are still occasions when planes departing to reach the required altitude literally fly over my house and turn. This creates roll back noise, which is why community members find the noise especially loud given the distance we are from the airport. Departures as I understand do not follow a specific flight path, they turn at a certain altitude based on the size of the plane. I fail to understand why these planes do not turn and fly over the CN McMillan railyard, the second largest in Canada.

Pearson recently implemented and consulted on a new arrival path. Staff specifically asked Pearson to move the path further east to reduce the impacts on the VMC area. The RioCan development appears to be close, possibly affected by the changes that NavCan & Transport Canada approved. I am concerned based on the heights and density proposed that RioCan has not been considerate of these recent changes. Should the development proceed as proposed this has the potential to impact GTAA's operations. The new arrival flight path as well as departures. I am also

very concerned that this development could result in impacts that result in more planes flying over existing low-rise developments. I ask that Vaughan Staff, NavCan, Transport Canada and RioCan are very, very, very transparent about consultation surrounding Pearson airport operations and that it be publicly documented in staff reports. Also that any noise studies include impacts from airport operations.

<https://www.navcanada.ca/en/consultation-report---toronto-airport-rnp-ar-approaches.pdf>

## **Greenspace & Parks**

Where is the Greenspace and community centers for this development? At present my community is experiencing increased usage of our greenspace from residents living in the VMC. They have no access to greenspace and travel outside of the VMC to other areas of Vaughan to utilize their water parks and greenspace. There has to be greenspace and water parks where people actually live, it can't be compensated elsewhere for it to be a complete community.

What is the status of Central Park in Vaughan? Are you reviewing development applications that are no on top of what was initially proposed and sold to the public as Central Park? It is difficult to know as there have been so many changes.

## **Transit & Traffic**

While I appreciate the new subway and do use it from time to time, traffic congestion has not improved, if anything it has gotten worse. That is because there is no transit that is convenient, reliable and accessible from the subway station. I live 4.0km from the VMC subway google tells me it would take 8min to drive there but 30m to take the bus, which includes a 15 minute walk to Weston Rd then transferring to a bus at Highway 7 that stops at the VMA subway.

I actually avoid the Jane and Highway 7 intersection even more than I used to, the subway has not improved traffic congestion. How much more traffic congestion can Highway 7 and Weston Rd accommodate without first investing in significant transit improvements to make it affordable and accessible that is a viable alternative to the automobile.

The level of tractor trailer traffic on Highway 7, as well as Langstaff has increased significantly, why can't they use Highway 407?

## **Secondary Plan Delayed?**

Why have Greenfield Secondary Plans in Blocks 41 and Blocks 27 been approved and prioritized ahead of the Weston & Secondary Plan? The result is that the actual density, population that developers clearly have planned for the City of Vaughan were never reflected during the Municipal

Comprehensive Review. This thereby led to a false pretense that more greenfield, farmland land was needed to be brought into the urban boundary. Why did staff prioritize the preparation of the greenfield secondary plans, Block 41 was approved in early 21 and Block 27 in 2018 by the City of Vaughan and 2019 by York Region?

Development applications are still coming in for this area, we have no approved secondary plan. Has this inaction and lack of prioritization by the City of Vaughan resulted in landowners/developers being in a position to now appeal due to a lack of decision by the City of Vaughan? It seems far too convenient 'out for Council', we can't make a decision because we don't have a secondary plan as required by our Official Plan, so now the developer has appealed for no decisions.

Thank you,  
Irene Ford