

Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting) Report

DATE: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 **WARD(S):** 1

TITLE: **BLOCK 41 BLOCK PLAN
FILE BL.41.2020
VICINITY OF KIRBY ROAD TO THE NORTH, WESTON ROAD
TO THE EAST, TESTON ROAD TO THE SOUTH, AND PINE
VALLEY DRIVE TO THE WEST**

FROM:

Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

ACTION: FOR INFORMATION

Purpose

To receive comments from the public and the Committee of the Whole related to the Block 41 Block Plan (File BL.41.2020), which seeks to implement and precisely locate the physical, environmental, social and economic aspects of development as planned for by the Block 41 Secondary Plan for the lands within Concession Block 41.

Report Highlights

- The Block 41 Block Plan is seeking to facilitate 4,417 residential units (equivalent to 13,493 people) on approximately 176 ha of land.
- The Block 41 Block Plan is proposing housing options that include single detached dwellings, townhouse dwellings and apartment dwellings.
- The Block 41 Block Plan is also proposing 7 parks, a public square, a co-location facility for community services, and 6 stormwater management facilities.
- Prior to the approval of the Block 41 Block Plan, or any related development application(s), the applicants are required to provide to the City a land use compatibility study that includes an analysis of the higher priority issues of life and fire safety as it relates to residential and institutional development directly adjacent to the TransCanada Pipeline Ltd. compressor station.
- The preliminary issues identified in this report, together with comments expressed by the public and the Committee of Whole at this Public Meeting, will be considered in a technical report at a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

Recommendations

1. THAT the Public Meeting report for Block Plan File BL.41.2020 (Block 41 Landowners Group) BE RECEIVED, and that any issues identified be addressed by the Policy Planning and Special Programs Department in a comprehensive technical report to the Committee of the Whole.

Background

The Block 41 Block Plan lands (the 'Subject Lands') are located within Concession Block 41, and are bounded by Kirby Road to the north, Weston Road to the east, Teston Road to the south, and Pine Valley Drive to the west; being Part of Lots 26-30, Concession 6, City of Vaughan (the 'City').

The Block 41 Concession Block (the 'Block') is approximately 428 hectares ('ha'), and contains active agricultural land; the Hamlet of Purpleville and an established residential community (the Purpleville Estates subdivision); the TransCanada Pipeline Ltd. ('TCPL') Compressor Station 130 ('compressor station') and related pipeline infrastructure; provincial Greenbelt Plan lands; tributaries and valley lands associated with East Purpleville Creek; and portions of the East Humber Wetland Complex (Provincially Significant Wetland ('PSW')) and unelevated wetlands that occur within and outside the Greenbelt Plan Area. The Block and surrounding land uses are shown on Attachment 1.

The Subject Lands, as shown on Attachment 3, are approximately 322.24 ha in size and account for approximately 75% of the Block. The Subject Lands contain approximately 137 ha of Greenbelt; and have a net developable area of approximately 176 ha (183 ha if measured to the centreline of the surrounding arterial road network). The Subject Lands do not include the Hamlet of Purpleville, the established residential subdivision located within the north-west quadrant of the Block, or the TCPL lands centrally located within the Block.

Block Plans are a comprehensive, non-statutory planning process

Similar to development applications, a block plan application is applicant-initiated, but it is not a statutory requirement of the *Planning Act* (the 'Act'). Block plans are a planning tool used to ensure all physical, environmental, social and economic aspects of development – as planned for through a secondary plan – are identified and precisely delineated within the plan area. A block plan serves as the comprehensive blueprint for future individual draft plans of subdivision and related development applications.

The block plan for Block 41 is required by Vaughan Official Plan 2010 ('VOP 2010') and by the Block 41 Secondary Plan (the 'Secondary Plan'). VOP 2010, Chapter 10, policies 10.1.1.14 to 10.1.1.26 establish the general policy framework when block plans are required and the minimum criteria that future development must address.

The Secondary Plan, Chapter 9, policy 9.1.2, requires that a future block plan be completed for the Subject Lands, and requires a set of specific studies be undertaken in support of the development of Block 41. The Secondary Plan, through Chapter 9, policy 9.4, also requires a detailed phasing plan be developed for the Subject Lands through the block plan process.

A Master Environmental Servicing Plan is required with a block plan application

An important component of the block plan application is the Master Environmental Servicing Plan ('MESP'), which is required by Chapter 3, policy 3.9.3.1 of VOP 2010. The MESP is a rigorous analysis of the environmental functions of the natural heritage network and the interrelationships among these functions. The MESP will, at minimum, outline and address:

- the inventory of all natural heritage features and ecosystems on site, and on adjacent and nearby sites, including groundwater resources;
- measures to improve natural heritage systems and ecosystem functions;
- the limits of development;
- the proposed approach to development as informed by the evaluation of features and functions, and additional infrastructure requirements;
- an assessment of impacts on natural heritage features and ecosystem functions;
- proposed environmental management techniques and measures to mitigate anticipated impacts;
- an assessment of impacts on natural hazards;
- recommendations for long-term management, monitoring requirements and contingency plans for the natural heritage network; and
- a statement on overall compliance with the environmental policies of VOP 2010.

The Block Plan application was submitted by the Block 41 Landowners Group

The Block Plan application, File BL.41.2020, was received by the Policy Planning and Special Programs ('PPSP') Department on January 12, 2022. The Block Plan application was submitted to the City by the participating landowners who are collectively known as the Block 41 Landowners Group (the 'applicant').

The majority of landowners, accounting for 297.26 ha and approximately 92% of the Subject Lands, are participating members of the Block 41 Landowners Group. A summary of the participating landowners and corresponding land area is provided on Table 1 of this report, and is further illustrated by Attachment 2.

Table 1: Block 41 Land Ownership, Participation and Area

Ownership	Land Area (ha)
Participating Landowners	297.26
1212763 Ontario Limited	43.44
TACC Developments (Block 41) Inc.	43.33
Block 41-28W Developments Limited	43.31
1212765 Ontario Limited	42.70
Kirbywest Limited	41.89
Block 41-28E Developments Limited	39.27
AMMP Holdings Inc.	20.84
Richmond Properties (Block 41) Inc.	12.49
Ritina Homes Limited	9.99
Non-participating Landowners	24.98
Total Land Area	322.24

A revised Terms of Reference ('ToR') and materials submitted in support of the Block Plan application were electronically circulated to internal City departments and external agencies on February 1, 2022. All comments on the proposed Block Plan application have now been received and provided to the applicant; this is discussed in greater detail later in this report.

The Block Plan is guiding the future development of a new community with single detached and townhouse dwellings, mid-rise development, parks, a co-location facility for community services and stormwater management facilities

The Block Plan, as shown on Attachment 3, illustrates the proposed land uses which include "low-rise residential", "low-rise mixed use", "mid-rise residential", "mid-rise mixed-used", "parks," and "natural areas" on the Subject Lands. The Block Plan is seeking to facilitate the future development of 4,417 residential units (equivalent to 13,493 people) on approximately 176 ha of land. The proposed density of the Block Plan is approximately 79 people and jobs per hectare, consistent with the density targets currently prescribed by the York Region Official Plan 2010, VOP 2010, and the Secondary Plan for this "New Community Area".

The proposed components of the Block Plan are generally concentrated to the north-easterly and the southern portions of the Block. Centrally located to the Block is the existing TCPL compressor station, and three (3) segments of the mainline pipeline that

run directly north, east and west from the compressor station. A significant natural heritage feature traverses the Subject Lands and includes tributaries and valleylands associated with the East Purpleville Creek, as well as portions of the Protected Countryside within the Greenbelt Plan Area. The natural heritage features are primarily located within the southern portions of the Block which extend and narrow to the north.

The residential component of the Block Plan will largely be comprised of low-rise residential housing forms, which includes single detached dwellings fronting on a public road (32% of the residential housing supply), lane access single detached dwellings (2%), lane access townhouse units (22%), and street access townhouse units (15%); low-rise mixed-use housing forms, which include back-to-back townhouses (1%); and mid-rise residential and mid-rise mixed-use development which include apartment units (18%), and senior apartment housing units (3%). There is also a medium density block, located on non-participating landowner lands, being reserved for mid-rise residential development, which may include future apartment units or townhouse units (7%).

The Block Plan illustrates the proposed location of amenities, such as parks, schools, a co-location facility, and stormwater management ('SWM') facilities. There are eight (8) parks proposed within the Subject Lands, comprised of seven (7) neighbourhood parks and one (1) public square. The parks have been co-located with schools or SWM facilities, with five (5) of the proposed parks located within the Greenbelt Plan Area. The public square is located in the north-eastern portion of the Subject Lands, and is meant to serve the mid-rise mixed-use block. A co-location facility, which is to be developed with a community centre, library and district-level park, is located along Weston Road, mid-block between Teston Road and Kirby Road.

The Block Plan depicts a road network that includes arterial, collector and local roads to serve the new community. The Subject Lands will primarily be served by a new east-west minor collector road accessible from Weston Road that transitions north-south to the central portion of the Block and connects to Teston Road (Street "A"). A second minor collector road is proposed, which traverses the Block north-south and primarily serves the northeast neighbourhood within the Subject Lands (Street "B"), and intersects with Street "A" in the eastern portion of the Block. Street "B" is bisected by TCPL driveway; a crossing over the TCPL lands is not proposed as part of this application, however, the future potential crossing is being protected for through road stubs.

The enabling policies and other elements of the proposed Block Plan are discussed in greater detail in the Analysis and Options section of this report.

Public Notice was provided in accordance with Council's Notification Protocol

- a) Date the Notice of Public Meeting was circulated: January 7, 2023.

The Notice of Public Meeting was also posted on the City's website at www.vaughan.ca.

- b) Circulation Area: to all property owners within the Subject Lands, to all property owners within 200 m of the Subject Lands, to all property owners within the Purpleville Estates subdivision, to the Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers' Association, to anyone on file with the Office of the City Clerk having requested notice for the Block 41 Secondary Plan, and to anyone on file with the Office of the City Clerk having requested notice for this application.

- c) The following is a summary of the written and verbal comments received as of January 17, 2023. The comments are organized by theme as follows:

The loss of Greenbelt Plan Area protections

Residents are concerned about the loss of protection afforded to portions of the Greenbelt Plan Area within Block 41 that have been downgraded as a result of a land use change from "Agricultural" to "Rural" by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's red-line approval of the York Region Official Plan 2021, which is unappealable.

Minister's Zoning Orders ('MZO') did not conform to the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 ('PPS')

Residents have expressed concern that the current Provincial Government retroactively changed legislation to avoid the appearance of MZOs being inconsistent with the PPS, given that MZOs provide little to no recourse for local governments and conservation authorities to uphold the PPS to protect woodlots and Provincially Significant Wetlands in eco-regions.

Any additional written comments received will be forwarded to the Office of the City Clerk to be distributed to the Committee of the Whole as a Communication and be reviewed and addressed by the PPSP Department in a future technical report to the Committee of the Whole.

Previous Reports/Authority

The following are links to reports regarding the approved Secondary Plan for the Subject Lands:

[New Community Area – Block 41 Secondary Plan Study Public Meeting, April 2, 2019, Committee of the Whole \(Public Hearing\), \(Item 3, Report 15\)](#)

[New Community Area – Block 41 Secondary Plan Study, September 24, 2019, Committee of the Whole \(Item 1, Report 25\)](#)

Analysis and Options

The Block 41 Block Plan is being developed in consideration of Provincial policy, as well as the Regional and local policy context

Consistency with the PPS, and conformity with provincial plans, such as A Place to Grow, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 (the ‘Growth Plan’) and the Greenbelt Plan, 2017; as well as the York Region Official Plan 2010 (‘YROP 2010’) was established as part of the approval of the Secondary Plan.

The Block Plan application is now seeking to precisely locate the physical, environmental, social and economic elements that were approved by the Secondary Plan for the Subject Lands; the location of these elements will be evaluated to ensure consistency with provincial policy, and conformity with provincial plans, and the regional and local policy context; more specifically:

York Region Official Plan 2010

At the time of submission of the Block Plan application, the YROP 2010 was the in-effect official plan for York Region. The YROP 2010 designates the subject lands “Urban Area” and “Protected Countryside” within the “Greenbelt Plan Boundary” by Map 1-Regional Structure. Portions of the Subject Lands are also designated “Agricultural Area” within the “Greenbelt Plan Boundary” by Map 8-Agricultural and Rural Area.

The Secondary Plan for the Subject Lands was developed with guidance by New Community Area policies of the YROP 2010, specifically policies 5.6.1 to 5.6.18; which seek to promote the development of new communities that are compact, vibrant, inclusive and diverse. The New Community Areas will prioritize people, sustainability and liveability; will protect the Regional Greenlands System, and provide connections to a network of parks and open spaces; and offer a variety of housing, employment and mobility choices. These objectives will be achieved

through the promotion of mixed-use communities with high-quality urban design, which attract residents and jobs.

Policy 5.6.3 of the YROP 2010 requires a minimum density of 20 residential units per hectare and a minimum density of 70 residents and jobs per hectare in the developable area. Following a deputation by the applicant at a York Region Committee of the Whole meeting on January 16, 2020, York Region Council adopted a resolution that regional staff be directed to report back to Regional Council on the New Community Area density, and the Designated Greenfield Area density, endorsed by York Region Council as being 50 people and jobs per hectare, as part of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review ('MCR'), as it relates to the Subject Lands.

Regional Official Plan Amendment 7 and York Region Official Plan 2021

A Regional Official Plan Amendment ('ROPA') for the Subject Lands, known as ROPA 7, was approved by York Region Council on October 28, 2021, which sought a redesignation for portions of the Greenbelt Plan Area on the Subject Lands from "Agricultural Area" to "Rural Area" to permit opportunities for recreational uses within the Greenbelt. The Agricultural designation of the YROP 2010 does not permit "major recreational uses", whereas policy 6.4.7 of the YROP 2010 permits "major recreational uses" in the "Rural" designation. ROPA 7 was forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing ('MMAH') for final approval, but no decision was on the amendment was ever released.

On June 30, 2022, York Region Council adopted the York Region Official Plan 2021 ('YROP 2021'), and on November 4, 2022, MMAH approved the YROP 2021, with red-line amendments, permitting active parkland and recreational uses on the ROPA 7 lands in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan, to be implemented through local secondary plans and/or site-specific development applications on the basis of appropriate technical studies and natural systems planning, which includes serviced playing fields, within the Rural Area. Confirmation is required from York Region that the intent of ROPA 7 – which redesignates portions of the Greenbelt from "Agricultural Area" to "Rural Area" to permit active recreational uses on the Greenbelt – has been incorporated into YROP 2021, and permits active recreational uses with the Greenbelt Plan Area on the Subject Lands.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010

The Subject Lands are located within the Urban Boundary, and are designated "Community Area" and "Natural Areas and Countryside within the Greenbelt Plan Area" by Schedule 1-Urban Structure of VOP 2010.

The Subject Lands are identified as being “Lands Subject to Secondary Plans” as well as “Natural Areas” and “Agricultural” within the “Greenbelt Plan Area” by Schedule 13-Land Use. VOP 2010, Volume 1, directs that policy for the Block 41 Block Plan be guided by the Block 41 Secondary Plan.

The Block 41 Secondary Plan

The Secondary Plan was adopted by the City on October 7, 2019, and approved by York Region Council on January 30, 2020. The Secondary Plan was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (‘OLT’, formerly the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and Ontario Municipal Board), and was subsequently approved by the OLT by an Order dated August 18, 2021, bringing the Secondary Plan into full force and effect as Official Plan Amendment 50 (‘OPA 50’) to VOP 2010.

The Secondary Plan establishes the land use planning and urban design policy framework guiding development for the Subject Lands. The Secondary Plan sets the vision for a complete community that is compact, vibrant, inclusive, healthy, sustainable and diverse. The Secondary Plan enables this by permitting a mix of uses, including residential, commercial and retail; a variety of built forms; as well as institutional and community uses focused within a centrally located community core. The Secondary Plan also establishes the framework for an interconnected system of parks, roads, sidewalks, and trails to create permeability and enhance access within the community, as shown on Attachment 5.

The Secondary Plan seeks the preservation, restoration and enhancement of the natural heritage network, which comprises approximately 40% of the Subject Lands, and which includes, but is not limited to wetlands, woodlands, permanent or intermittent streams, valley and stream corridors, fish habitat, and significant wildlife habitats; the vast majority of which is located within the Greenbelt Plan Area.

The Block 41 MZO

On November 6, 2020, MMAH issued O. Regulation 644/20, being an MZO for a portion of the Subject Lands located outside the Greenbelt Plan Area establishing zoning permissions for residential, retail, commercial, office, and institutional uses within the Block.

The MZO implements land use zones that include “Low-Rise Residential”, “Low-Rise Mixed-Use”, “Mid-Rise Residential” and “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use”, as shown on Attachment 4.

Legislative changes being initiated by the Provincial Government relating to the Greenbelt Plan and Greenbelt Area boundary regulation may impact the developable area within Block 41

On November 4, 2022, the Provincial Government announced changes to the Greenbelt Plan and Greenbelt Area boundary regulation that seeks to remove approximately 2,995 ha (7,400 acres) over 15 areas of land from the Greenbelt; this includes lands designated Protected Countryside located within Block 41, municipally known as 11031, 11065 and 11141 Pine Valley Drive, as schematically shown on Attachment 6.

The lands being considered for removal are under the ownership of both participating (TACC Developments (Block 41), and Block 41-28W Developments Limited) and non-participating landowners (Maria and Vito Burdi). At the time of the writing of this report, the Provincial Government has not issued a decision on the designation of the lands.

It should be noted the lands being considered for removal from the Greenbelt are designated “Agricultural” by the Secondary Plan, and are not zoned by the MZO that was issued for Block 41. Accordingly, should the lands be removed Greenbelt, the applicants will be required to amend the Block Plan application, and all supporting material submitted in support of the application, to demonstrate how the lands could be developed in keeping with the goals and objectives of the Secondary Plan; and obtain all the necessary approvals, including but not limited to, official plan amendment(s) and zoning by-law amendment(s), in order to facilitate future development.

The proposed Block Plan seeks to accommodate land uses and built form typologies consistent with the permissions of the Secondary Plan

The proposed Block Plan, as shown on Attachment 3, is seeking to accommodate land uses and built form typologies that are consistent with the in-effect legislative framework and the permissions of the Secondary Plan.

Development Statistics

Based on the proposed Block Plan, the following land uses and corresponding statistics, as shown in Table 2, have been provided for the Subject Lands. These statistics include both the participating and non-participating landowners’ lands:

Table 2: Proposed Land Uses

Land Use Block	Area (ha)	Percent of Land Area
Residential Area	92.18	28.6%
Co-located Community Centre	6.01	1.9%
Schools	13.68	4.2%

Land Use Block	Area (ha)	Percent of Land Area
Parks	5.80	1.8%
Vistas (Open Space)	0.61	0.2%
SWM Ponds	6.64	2.1%
Natural Heritage Network	7.39	2.3%
Roads	42.18	13.1%
Private Lanes	5.35	1.7%
Road Widening	3.34	1.0%
TCPL Easements	1.48	0.5%
Lands within the Greenbelt Plan Area	137.58	42.7%
Roads in Greenbelt	2.92	0.9%
Road Widening in Greenbelt	1.10	0.3%
SWM Ponds in Greenbelt	11.64	3.6%
Parks in Greenbelt	13.61	4.2%
Natural Heritage in Greenbelt	108.31	33.6%
TOTAL AREA	322.24	100%

Land Use and Built Form

The Block Plan is seeking to implement a variety of land uses and built forms, including the “Low-Rise Residential”, “Low-Rise Mixed-Use”, “Mid-Rise Residential”, and “Mid-Rise Mixed-Use” designations, consistent with the permissions of the Secondary Plan. These land use designations accommodate building typologies that include single detached dwellings, townhouses, back-to-back townhouses, and apartment units, which are distributed throughout the Subject Lands, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Proposed Building Typologies

Building Type	Number of Units	Percent of Building Stock
Single Detached (Fronting on a Public Road)	1,415	32%
Single Detached (Fronting on a Private Road)	108	2%

Building Type	Number of Units	Percent of Building Stock
Townhouse (Fronting on a Public Road)	664	15%
Townhouse (Fronting on a Private Road)	954	22%
Townhouse (Back-to-Back)	38	1%
Apartment Units	939	21%
Market Units	800	18%
Senior Units	139	3%
Medium Density Blocks	298	7%
TOTAL	4418	100%

Land uses, compatibility, the road network and community facilities within the Block will be delineated through this Block Plan exercise and are subject to change based on the preliminary review of the application

As previously noted, the first submission of the Block Plan application has been comprehensively reviewed by internal City departments and external agencies; these comments have been provided to the applicant. Based on the comments received as part of the initial circulation of the application, it is anticipated that elements of Block Plan – including, but not limited to, the plan configuration, setbacks, housing unit mix and associated units and density, may change as part of subsequent submissions of this application.

The PPSP Department has identified the following matters – which are not exhaustive – to be reviewed in greater detail as part of subsequent submissions, and prior to any approvals for the Block Plan

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
a.	Conformity with the Provincial policies, York Region Official Plan 2010, and the Block 41 Secondary Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Block Plan application will be reviewed for conformity with Provincial policy, such as the Greenbelt Plan, the policies of the YROP 2010, and the Block 41 Secondary Plan (OPA 50). ▪ Confirmation is required that MMAH’s approval of YROP 2021, with amendments, implement the ROPA 7 policies that permit active recreation uses within the Greenbelt Plan Area, and permit the Block Plan as proposed. Amendments to the Secondary Plan may be required to implement the

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
		<p>permissions that permit active recreational uses on the Greenbelt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Through the Block Plan application, confirmation is required that York Region has approved a reduced density for the Subject Lands, from 70 people and jobs per hectare, to 50 people and jobs per hectare. ▪ The review of the Block Plan application will consider, but is not limited to, the proposed land use designations; building heights and densities; retail and commercial uses to serve the new community; placement of parks, schools and community facilities; the layout and configuration of the proposed transportation and trail network; the design, location and function of the SWM facilities and related infrastructure; and phasing and implementation.
b.	Compatibility with the TCPL Compressor Station 130	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compatibility between the proposed residential uses and the existing compressor station and related pipeline infrastructure must be reviewed. ▪ As part of this evaluation, the applicants are required to provide a land use compatibility report based on the Risk-Based Land Use Planning Guideline developed by the Major Industrial Accidents Council of Canada ('MIACC'); the Draft Land Use Compatibility Guidelines by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, dated March 2021; and using the provincial D-1 to D-1.3 Land Use Compatibility guidelines, D-3 Environmental Considerations for Gas or Oil Pipelines and Facilities guidelines, and D-6 Compatibility with Industrial Facility guidelines.
b.	Compatibility with the TCPL Compressor Station 130 Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The appropriateness of the proposed setbacks recommended by the study – particularly for the residential, school and community uses - from compressor station will be evaluated. ▪ The applicant's will be required to implement the findings of the land use compatibility study, to the satisfaction of the City, which may result in a reconfiguration of the Block Plan, prior to any approvals for the Block Plan application. ▪ The City may, at its sole discretion, retain a peer reviewer, at the sole expense of the applicant, to review the land use compatibility study and the appropriateness of the land use compatibility study's recommendations.

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
c.	Studies and Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The following technical reports and supporting materials have been submitted in support of the Block Plan application, and must be approved to the satisfaction of the City or respective approval authority prior to final approval of the Block Plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Block Plan Report (prepared by Malone Given Parsons, dated December 2021), which includes the following appendices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Block Plan (prepared by Malone Given Parsons, dated July 13, 2021) ○ Transportation Mobility Assessment Study (prepared by Poulos & Chung Ltd., dated December 2021) ○ Parks Facility Fit Plans (prepared by Schollen & Company Inc., dated April 29, 2021) ○ Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines (prepared by The MBTW Group and WAI Studio, dated December 2021) ○ Community Core Feasibility Study (prepared by Schollen & Company Inc., dated December 2021) ○ Sustainability Performance Metrics (completed by Malone Given Parsons, dated December 2021) ○ Environmental Noise Feasibility Study (prepared by Valcoustics Canada Ltd., dated December 10, 2021) ○ Air Quality Impact Assessment Report (prepared by GHD, dated November 29, 2021) ○ Agricultural Impact Assessment (prepared by Colville Consulting Inc., dated September 20, 2021) ○ Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (prepared by Wayne Morgan, Heritage Planner, dated June 2015) ○ Archaeological Assessments (prepared by This Land Archaeology Inc. or AMICK Consultants Ltd.) ○ Environmental Site Assessments (prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd. or WSP Canada Inc.) 2. Master Environmental Servicing Plan (prepared by Malone Given Parsons, dated December 2021) 3. East Purple Creek Subwatershed Study (prepared by Savanta Inc., R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd., Schaeffers Consulting Engineers, Geo Morphix Limited, Stoneybrook Consulting Inc., Malone Given Parsons Ltd., and Schollen & Company Inc., dated December 2021)

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional studies and/or reports, including but not limited to the land use compatibility study, may be required as part of the application review process.
d.	Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Subject Lands contain cultural heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes; the Block Plan will be reviewed for conformity with applicable <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> provisions and City policy, and must be cleared of archaeological concerns, to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and the Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division of the Development Planning Department.
e.	Agricultural Impact Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Subject Lands, as well as the surrounding lands to Block 41, contain active and retired farms, necessitating the submission of an Agricultural Impact Assessment ('AIA') as part of the Block Plan application. The AIA must have consideration for Minimum Distance Separation ('MDS') formulae to farm operations outside the Subject Lands. ▪ Landscaping and tree planting have been recommended for visual screening as part of the Block Plan application; however, considerations for odor control have not been made. ▪ The City may, at its sole discretion, retain a peer reviewer, at the sole expense of the applicant, to review the AIA and the appropriateness of the AIA's recommendations.
f.	Allocation and Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A phasing plan will be required as part of the Block Plan application to identify the timing of infrastructure and servicing required to serve future development within the Block. ▪ Through the approvals process for the future development application(s), should the application(s) be approved, the availability of water and sanitary servicing capacity for the development must be identified and allocated by Vaughan Council.
g.	Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Block Plan application will be reviewed in consideration of the City's Sustainability Metrics Program. The Block Plan application presently achieves a score of 30 points; however, the proposed Block Plan shall be required to achieve a minimum "Bronze" score of 31 to 40 points.
h.	Parkland Dedication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Block Plan application will be reviewed in consideration of the requirements of the <i>Planning Act</i>, the YROP 2021, and the City of Vaughan's Parkland Dedication Policy with respect to parkland dedication requirements.

	MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED	COMMENT(S)
i.	Affordable Housing	<p>The Block Plan application will be reviewed in consideration of Provincial, Regional and City polices to ensure that the development provides an appropriate level, range and mix of unit sizes and types to meet the City's affordable housing goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A minimum 25% of the housing units within the Block Plan are required to be affordable, and a portion of those units need to be made accessible to people with disabilities.
j.	Future Related Development Applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any development application(s) submitted for the Subject Lands will be reviewed for conformity with the Block Plan application. ▪ The Block Plan application must be considered in a future technical report to Vaughan Council prior to the approval of any related development application(s) for the Subject Lands.

Preliminary issues on the first submission of the Block 41 Block Plan have been identified by internal City departments and external agencies

The Block Plan application has been circulated to internal City departments and external agencies for review and comment; all comments have been received and provided to the applicant. Through an initial review of the Block Plan application, the following preliminary matters have been identified, which are not exhaustive, that are required to be addressed as part of subsequent submissions of the Block Plan application:

General Comments

There are opportunities based on the approved Secondary Plan policies and the MZO to incorporate more retail and commercial uses into the Subject Lands. This should be explored to provide better local services to future residents. More specifically, policy 11.14.2.5 of the Secondary Plan states "A community core within reasonable walking distance from the majority of the population which will be the focus of local retail and community services and will provide connections to transit", however, the proposed location of Community Core is at the periphery of community, and contains no retail.

The policy and regulatory framework for the Subject Lands permits a wide variety of land use designations and building typologies. Consideration should be given to providing a greater variety of development typologies and uses in the low-rise mixed use and mid-rise mixed use designations to bring the Block Plan into better alignment with the vision established by the Secondary Plan.

Land Use Compatibility

The Secondary Plan for the Subject Lands deferred the evaluation of land use compatibility to the Block Plan stage. The Secondary Plan provides for the submission of a land use compatibility study that evaluates compatibility with TCPL's federally regulated operations. The application submitted in support of the Block Plan has focused on the issues of noise and vibration from the TCPL compressor station; however, the City is seeking an analysis of the higher priority issues of life and fire safety as it relates to residential and institutional development directly adjacent to the TCPL compressor station.

Prior to any approvals for the Block Plan application, the applicants are required to submit a land use compatibility study, that considers the Risk-Based Land Use Planning Guideline developed by the Major Industrial Accidents Council of Canada ('MIACC'); the Draft Land Use Compatibility Guidelines by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, dated March 2021; and using the provincial D-1 to D-1.3 Land Use Compatibility guidelines, D-3 Environmental Considerations for Gas or Oil Pipelines and Facilities Guide, and D-6 Compatibility with Industrial Facility guidelines.

The land use compatibility study must include, at minimum, an analysis of the following:

- fugitive emissions in relation to blowdowns
- risk assessment and hazard distances that are modeled for liquified natural gas (i.e., sweet gas) under pressure and mercaptan
- assessment of risk based on ERG 2020 and Safety Data Sheets of hazardous materials
- impact distances and proposed sensitive receptors affected (residential and community facilities) in jet fire, high pressure release without fire and explosion from compressor station and pipeline in all directions
- modelling should be based on 1 PSI over pressure in the pipeline (i.e., if the pipeline is 900 PSI, modelling uses 901 PSI)
- structural and non-structural mitigations measures that will be employed by the developers that are above and beyond emergency response activities by the City
- a piece on responding to pipeline fires as they cannot be directly extinguished; natural gas collecting in low lying areas, fire risk to surrounding areas and structures such as grass fires, and evacuation radii for a facility of this size adjacent to occupied structures

The City may, at its sole discretion, retain a peer reviewer, at the sole expense of the applicant, to review the land use compatibility study and the appropriateness of the land use compatibility study's recommendations.

Affordable Housing

The Secondary Plan requires a minimum 25% of the housing units within Block 41 to be affordable, with a portion of these units accessible to people with disabilities. Section 3.4.1 of the Secondary Plan also requires that the allocation of affordable housing units by the participating landowners be established through the Block Plan process. A Housing Options Statement was included with the Block Plan Report submitted in support of the application, but did not specify how many units would be affordable, nor how these units would be allocated amongst the participating landowners. The Housing Options Statement must be updated to detail how the affordability requirements will be achieved and allocated.

In addition, some of the suggested affordable housing units, specifically the secondary/garden suites (also known as additional residential units), are being used as the noise attenuation feature between the Subject Lands and the TCPL compressor station. The appropriateness of this condition needs to be evaluated, given the purpose of noise attenuation features is to reduce noise pollution for future residents.

Laneway Design

The Block Plan includes both single-loaded and double-loaded laneways to provide access to some of the proposed single detached and townhouse dwelling units. The construction of laneways is discouraged from an operations and safety perspective. In situations where the construction of new laneways is unavoidable, it is recommended only single-loaded laneways be considered, which are designed to include one-way traffic, adequate snow storage, and direct access to dwelling units.

TCPL Easements

The Block Plan lands are the subject of a MZO, which is in full force and effect, and permits a number of residential, retail, restaurant, commercial and institutional uses on the Subject Lands. The MZO also establishes zoning requirements with respect to the natural gas pipeline easements, however, the location and widths of the existing/in-effect easements over the pipeline infrastructure have not been identified and may conflict with the location of proposed development.

Furthermore, per policy 6.6.3 of the Secondary Plan, parkland is not permitted within the setbacks to the pipeline right-of-way; this may impact Park P5 and the co-location facility, as shown on Attachment 3.

Co-Location Facility

The proposed co-location facility, which includes a community centre, library and district level park has been located on the north side of Street 'A', as shown on Attachment 3. The City has concerns with the proposed location of the co-location facility given its proximity to the TCPL compressor station. The proposed community centre is intended to be used as an emergency shelter, and as such, should be located as far as possible from the TCPL compressor station. The City is seeking justification and analysis to support a relocation of the co-location facility to the north side of Street 'A'.

It is the preference of the City that the location of the co-location facility be in alignment with the area identified by the Secondary Plan, as shown on Attachment 5, which provides for greater separation distances from the TCPL compressor station and pipeline infrastructure. The location of the co-location facility should be explored in the requested land use compatibility report, as noted above, and reviewed for conformity with the Draft Land Use Compatibility Guidelines by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, dated March 2021, and provincial D-6 guidelines for compatibility between industrial facilities.

Greenbelt Plan Area

The City will be seeking the conveyance of the Greenbelt Plan lands into public ownership to ensure its long-term protection and restoration, and for the promotion of urban agriculture.

Encroachments into Greenbelt

It has been identified by internal City departments, as well as external agencies, that portions of the proposed internal road network abutting and/or encroach into the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan, which is not consistent with Section 4.2 of the Greenbelt Plan.

Per policy 3.2.3.4 of VOP 2010, natural heritage features within the Greenbelt require a 30 m vegetation protection zone ('VPZ'). The material submitted in support of the Block Plan application do not follow the minimum VPZ requirements, as several encroachments into the VPZ have been identified within the Greenbelt Plan Area. Residential development and park features must be removed from natural heritage features and their associated VPZs on the Greenbelt.

SWM infrastructure should not impact natural heritage features and their associated VPZs. Therefore, SWM Pond 4, as shown on Attachment 3, should be redesigned outside of the VPZ of a significant valley feature.

Schools

The Block Plan application proposes three (3) elementary school sites, and one (1) secondary school site, as shown on Attachment 3. Two (2) of the elementary school sites and the secondary school site have been identified for the York Catholic District School Board ('YCDSB'), and the remaining elementary school site for the York Region District School Board ('YRDSB').

Accordingly, the Block Plan application has been circulated to YRDSB, YCDSB, and the French school boards - Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir and Conseil scolaire Viamonde - for review and comment. The Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir has not provided comments on the Block Plan application, while the Conseil scolaire Viamonde has advised they have no comments.

YRDSB have advised they are generally satisfied with the location and size of the proposed elementary school site, but have concerns respecting its configuration. YRDSB requires a minimum depth of 125 m to facilitate the development of their elementary school model, however, the maximum depth provided for the school block is 105.9 m. YRDSB is requesting that the applicants revise the school block to have a minimum depth of 125 m, or alternatively, provide a facility fit plan which demonstrates that a typical elementary school can be accommodated on the current configuration which meets the needs of the YRDSB.

YCDSB have advised they are generally satisfied with the location and size of the proposed elementary school sites, however, they note that with respect to the proposed secondary school, the site requires direct driveway access from two (2) public roadways, preferably from Teston Road and the future Street "A". If York Region does not permit an access to the school block from Teston Road, a second access will be required from the local public road on the northern lot line of the school block.

YCDSB also note that Policy 8.2 of the Secondary Plan requires that the phasing of schools and parks be available during the initial phases of development. The applicants are required to provide phasing details to identify which school sites will be available through each phase of development.

Urban Design

The Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Division of the Development Planning Department note that public exposure along the natural heritage system and the Protected Countryside should be increased where feasible, consistent with the policy direction in the Secondary Plan. This can be accomplished by promoting

more single-loaded roads and staging areas (e.g. vistas, trailheads, walkway blocks, etc.).

Per policy 6.1.2(2) of the Secondary Plan, “reverse frontages should be avoided”. The co-location facility is surrounded by the rear of townhouse units, which is not a desirable interface, and where alternatives should be considered.

The proposed location of the secondary school block, located along Teston Road, and abutting “Low Medium Density (Lane Access)” development is not a desirable interface, and should be revised to allow for better integration with the rest of the community.

The applicants are required to identify significant intersections within the community; consider wider sidewalks or multi-use pathways along collector roads to promote additional connectivity with the proposed multi-use recreational trail network; and consider vehicular lay-by parking spots and waiting areas along institutional blocks, park blocks, open space lands and single-loaded roads, where feasible.

Cultural Heritage

The Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (‘CHRIA’) submitted in support of the Block Plan recommends the Irvin Farmhouse (11141 Pine Valley Drive) as a candidate for designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, given the presence of built heritage and cultural heritage landscape value. The CHRIA also recommends Miller Farm (11011 and 11031 Pine Valley Drive) as candidate for retention and listing under Part IV, Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Urban Design and Cultural Heritage Staff are seeking additional information on each of these properties to determine their cultural heritage value, and to evaluate restoration and integration opportunities.

As currently proposed, the service plan and street layout of the Block Plan do not incorporate cultural heritage landscapes (‘CHLs’). Where it is not feasible to retain the recommended CHLs, it is recommended that future street and park names be derived from the CHRIA which documents the landscapes, and commemorative plaques be installed to identify lost CHLs and their cultural heritage value.

The applicants have submitted completed archaeological assessments (‘AA’) and supporting Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport clearance letters; however, all the lands designated Protected Countryside have not had a Stage 2AA, and have not been cleared of archaeological concerns. The responsibility of the

completion of these AAs must be considered should these lands be dedicated into public ownership. Additionally, in light of the evolving practices surrounding Indigenous engagement, proponents of development applications are required to engage with the relevant Indigenous communities during this process and future AAs.

Parks

Based on provision levels established by the in-effect Active Together Master Plan ('ATMP'), the proposed population of Block 41 warrants at least 13 hectares ('ha') of programmable parkland. The proposed Block Plan application is seeking to permit 20.35 ha of parkland, with 13.61 ha (approximately 66%) on the Greenbelt, and 6.74 ha (approximately 44%) on non-Greenbelt lands.

Five (5) of the eight (8) parks proposed as part of the Block Plan application are located within the Greenbelt Plan Area (being parks P4, P5, P6, P7 and P8 as shown on Attachment 3). It is understood that proposed parkland within the Greenbelt Plan Area, can be facilitated by MMAH's approval of the YROP 2021, subject to additional criteria; however, confirmation is required in this regard. In addition, the City is seeking that the applicant provide a rationale as to how the Greenbelt Plan provisions will be met, ensuring the proposed parks are able to be programmed with recreational uses such as sports fields and courts, play equipment, and other facilities under the "Rural" redesignation of the Greenbelt Plan.

While it is understood that active parkland on the Greenbelt is permitted by MMAH's approval of the YROP 2021, the proposed parks should not be subject to restrictions that prohibit public recreational programming. Four (4) of the five (5) parks that are proposed within the Greenbelt Plan Area are encumbered by natural heritage features, including wetlands, woodlands, natural hazards and their associated VPZs. These encumbrances will restrict park programming. In accordance with Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan, where parks are proposed within the Greenbelt Plan Area, they must be located outside key natural heritage features and key hydrogeological features and their associated VPZs, and also outside prime agricultural areas.

To ensure that local residents have access to park facilities in a reasonable time frame, the delivery of parkland is required in coordination with residential development. The delivery of parkland shall be completed no later than two (2) growing seasons from the issuance of the first building permit for the phase which contains the park, and/or at 25% occupancy of the homes within the subdivision or surrounding subdivisions served by the park. However, some of

the proposed parkland is located on lands held by non-participating landowners, which restricts the development and delivery of parkland in a reasonable timeframe for future residents. Accordingly, parkland needs to be relocated to lands held by participating landowners.

The Parks Facility Fit Plans submitted in support of the proposed Block Plan application provide preliminary programming details for the proposed parks, but does not take into consideration existing constraints or conditions of the proposed parklands. Considerations must include:

- Existing and proposed grades, and areas with steep slopes
- Hazard lands and ecologically sensitive areas
- SWM infrastructure
- Areas with existing vegetation and significant flora/fauna
- Species, age, size and condition of existing trees
- Required restoration works and edge management plans where parks abut open spaces and VPZs
- The layout of facilities, and required setbacks
- The percentage of disturbed area
- Proposed location of required water and sanitary infrastructure
- The interface with adjacent development to mitigate conflicts
- Preliminary construction cost estimates

Some of the proposed parks are encumbered by underground servicing and SWM infrastructure; accordingly, letters of credit and a onetime payment for the future and incremental costs of operation, maintenance and life cycle costs of the infrastructure is required. Additional restrictions imposed by the non-standard underground SWM infrastructure will add flexibility constraints to the use of surface programming, and add additional costs to the installation of facilities on top of SWM infrastructure; additional costs will be incurred beyond those set by current levels of service for similar facilities. In order to proceed with park development over SWM infrastructure, park programming flexibility and design restrictions, and technical details such as, but not limited to, soil depths, structure footings and tree canopy requirements must be addressed.

Multi-Use Recreations Trails

The Secondary Plan requires a Multi-Use Recreational Trails Master Plan to be submitted with the Block Plan application; however, the applicants have only submitted a Trails Concept Plan to date. A more detailed analysis, highlighting opportunities and constraints presented by existing and proposed conditions, and exploring costing and phasing of implementation, is required. Future connections

are critical to achieving connectivity between the different neighbourhoods within the Block, and facilitates access to various amenities for active transportation users; the provision of these connections is required by the Secondary Plan and should be coordinated with the Parks Infrastructure Planning and Development ('PIDP') Department. In addition, there appear to be inconsistencies between the Trails Concept Plan and the trails map shown within the Transportation Mobility Plan Study; these plans must be revised to be consistent.

Like parkland development, the implementation of the multi-use recreational trails must coincide with the development of lands, or each phase thereof. The phasing, prioritization and ultimate construction of the transportation network, including the multi-use recreational trails, will be based on an order established through the Block Plan process ensuring the required external and internal connections are provided.

Access to multi-use recreational trails is to be provided every 150 m, and shall be laid out and designed to: maintain visual and physical public access; maximize safety; and minimize conflicting privacy issues. Multi-use recreational trails are to have a minimum width of 6.0 m (which includes a 3 m hard surface and 1.5 m clearance and mowed strip on either side), a vertical clearance of 3.0 m, a maximum slope of 5%, and must meet the Accessibility Design Guidelines for York Region Forest Trails.

Where trails are proposed within the Greenbelt Plan Area, they must be located outside key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features and their associated VPZs, and outside of prime agricultural areas, in accordance with Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 4.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan.

The trails located in between the two elementary school sites along Street "A", should be aligned as close as possible to the local roads flanking the neighbourhood park located on the north side of Street "A" to provide for safer, accessible pedestrian crossings. The trail connections as proposed create safety challenges for students, parents, and visitors crossing Street "A" to access the parks and schools. Provisions for a pedestrian crossing are warranted to provide safe crossings along local roads flanking parks.

Active Transportation Network and Sidewalks

There is misalignment between the Transportation Mobility Assessment Study submitted in support of this application and the Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines, regarding the provision of sidewalks. The Transportation Mobility Assessment Study proposes rights-of-way ('ROW') that incorporate a sidewalk

on only one side of the road; however, the Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines note the provision of sidewalks on both sides of the road. Sidewalks are to be provided on both sides of local roads that serve transit routes/stations, schools, community centres, parks, and other public facilities.

Per the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and City-wide engineering standards, the two collector roads – Streets “A” and “B” – should include separated active transportation facilities on both sides of the road in the form of a minimum 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk and minimum 1.5 m wide asphalt pathway. A sidewalk plan is required to confirm the location of the sidewalks on all proposed roads within the Block.

The City of Vaughan Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (2020) requires cycling facilities in-boulevard on both sides of all collector roads. Accordingly, Streets “A” and “B” are required to feature cycling facilities throughout both sides of the road.

Transportation and Road Network

A traffic management plan must be provided which details the road ROWs, sidewalk, trail and cycling facility locations, methods of traffic control, crossing locations, and traffic calming measures throughout the Block. As previously noted, pedestrian crossings at school blocks must be reviewed to maximize safe crossing locations and reduce the number of potential informal, unprotected crossings.

A significant portion of the proposed road network has long, straight throughways conducive to speeding. The incorporation of speed management and traffic calming measures are required along Street “A” and Street “B” to reduce vehicular speeds. The City encourages collector and local roads to be designed for 40 km/hr speeds, with a pavement width of 3.3 m and up to a maximum of 3.5 m where public transit is proposed. Additionally, all way stop control warrants should be conducted for internal collector road intersections.

Street “A” should connect Teston Road to Weston Road as part of the initial phase of development, as this link will be the primary spine road for the Block and creates connectivity and access to the surrounding road network for all users. It is understood that this road connection will not be constructed until 2031. The layout/lotting for the proposed Street “B”, where it meets the TCPL lands, must be reconsidered. Should Street “B” be continuous across the TCPL lands, four (4) intersections would exist within a very short distance.

The applicants are proposing collector roads with ROW widths of 27.5 m and 24.0 m throughout the Block. However, City of Vaughan engineering standards require all two-lane collector roads to have a ROW of 24.0 m, unless required otherwise.

Offset intersections must be minimized or eliminated throughout the Block. There are numerous instances where offset intersection conditions are shown. In addition, the location of the accesses to Weston Road should be coordinated with the Block 34W Landowners Group, to ensure that intersections are aligned and can be protected for potential future signalization.

The City discourages laneway angle bends, which is a condition that should be minimized to the greatest extent possible throughout the Subject Lands. The City also discourages laneway-to-laneway intersections. In addition, laneway accesses are shown to Weston Road; these should be removed per York Region access requirements.

The Transportation Mobility Assessment Study submitted in support of the proposed Block Plan has identified traffic issues along the ingress/access points at the periphery of the Subject Lands. This should be further investigated, so infiltration issues can be mitigated prior to development occurring. This is also an issue given the proximity of the Subject Lands to the future east-west provincial highway (i.e., Highway 413).

City-wide Integrated Urban Water Master Plan

The City's Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management ('IPCAM') Department have reviewed the first submission of the Block Plan and note the Block 41 service area shall conform to the conclusions and recommendations of the City-wide Integrated Urban Water Master Plan ('IUW-MP') Class Environmental Assessment ('EA') Study, as well as York Region's detailed design of the Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing Project and York Region's on-going Water and Wastewater Master Plan update study.

IPCAM also notes financial commitments must be secured at the future draft plan of subdivision and/or site plan stage for costs associated with implementing the recommendations of the IUW-MP EA to the satisfaction of the City.

Water Distribution

From a water distribution perspective, it is unclear how external lands to the Subject Lands will be serviced, specifically with respect to the existing Purpleville Estates subdivision, the properties fronting onto Pine Valley Drive, and the TCPL

lands. Additional analysis and servicing recommendations are required for these lands.

Additional information is required as it relates to the proposed water distribution infrastructure in Pressure District ('PD') 7, and the transition or future connection to PD8.

The water distribution infrastructure to be constructed in the northeast portion of the City, which will help facilitate and service the proposed Block Plan, includes a booster pumping station for PD8 in the vicinity of Jane Street and Teston Road, a PD8 watermain along Jane Street (from Teston Road to King Vaughan Road), two PD8 elevated water storage facilities, and a PD9 water booster station in the vicinity of Jane Street and Kirby Road. The construction of water distribution infrastructure in northeast Vaughan will be completed in two phases in 2025 and 2028. As a condition of approval, the Owner(s) shall agree to front-end finance, construct and/or contribute its proportionate share of the costs associated with implementing the recommended municipal servicing infrastructure improvements identified in the City's on-going IUW-MP EA, at the development application approval stage, to the satisfaction of the City.

The water distribution projects for ultimate servicing are included in the City-Wide Development Charges By-law, and include Block 41. Financial securities towards a commitment to construct the applicable water distribution systems infrastructure will be required as a condition of development approval for any future development application(s) for the Subject Lands.

Wastewater Servicing

Block 41 is located within the northeast Vaughan service area in the York-Durham Sewage System; the EA for the Northeast Vaughan Water and Wastewater Servicing Project is currently being undertaken by York Region. Accordingly, the MESP for the Block 41 application is proposing both an interim and ultimate servicing strategy. The interim servicing strategy is being proposed to bridge the gap between near term servicing and ultimate servicing in 2028 by York Region. The implementation of the proposed interim strategy will be subject to conditions, at the development application approval stage, which must be completed to the satisfaction of the City.

The MESP submitted in support of the proposed Block Plan must be revised to reflect an internal, local sewer system, to be designed and constructed by the applicant. All references to this undertaking being a City project, must be revised.

Stormwater Management

The City is not supportive of using pervious storm sewers and catch basins, as proposed within the MESP, due to operation and maintenance issues, and infiltration of untreated stormwater.

Infiltration trenches and chambers are being proposed in the Block Plan's parkland; approval from the PIPD Department is required to permit this type of infrastructure in City parks. Additionally, infiltration trenches are also proposed within the VPZs of natural heritage features, which create operation and maintenance challenges for the City. The City is not supportive of water quality measures being achieved through infiltration on public lands, and within hazard areas and valley lands.

It is recommended that the applicants refrain from incorporating any public amenity or trail features within the SWM blocks other than for stormwater quantity/quality control or maintenance purposes.

Phasing of Development

As previously noted, a phasing plan has not been submitted with the Block 41 Block Plan application to date. The applicants shall provide a phasing plan that identifies, at minimum, the timing of the road network, parks, schools, external infrastructure and servicing, etc. to serve the proposed Block Plan.

The above noted comments are not exhaustive, and the applicants will be required to address concerns as part of their resubmission(s) to the City, and prior to final approval of the Block Plan and any subsequent development application(s) approvals.

Financial Impact

There are no financial requirements for new funding associated with this report.

Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations

The first submission of the Block Plan has been circulated to external agencies, including York Region and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) for review and comment.

York Region has identified issues to be addressed through this application

The first submission of the Block Plan has been circulated to York Region for review and comment. York Region has completed their preliminary review, and have noted the following matters – which are not exhaustive – required to be addressed:

Permitting Parks within the Greenbelt

On May 5, 2022, prior to MMAH's approval of YROP 2021, York Region advised that while they have no comments relating to the general layout and configuration of the proposed Block Plan, which they consider to generally implement the policies and land uses of the Secondary Plan; they do have concerns as it relates to the specific park locations. More specifically, four (4) of the eight (8) parks proposed as part of the Block Plan are located within the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan Area. ROPA 7 would have the effect of redesignating certain lands from "Agricultural Area" to "Rural Area", which would permit active parklands within the Protected Countryside designation. Until confirmation that active recreation uses are permitted on these Greenbelt Lands, these parks are to be considered illustrative, demonstrating potential fit and layout.

Water Resources

York Region's Water Resources Department notes that the Subject Lands are an identified "Area of Concern", due to known high water table conditions and confined artesian aquifer conditions. This could have geotechnical implications with respect to construction activities, including but not limited to, dewatering, foundation construction, and building stability. Accordingly, it is recommended that any geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations take into account that groundwater levels may be artificially depressed at the site due to third party permanent dewatering systems in the area.

Transportation

York Region has identified a number of modifications that are required for the transportation study submitted in support of the proposed Block Plan application.

York Region has also identified that the transportation study incorrectly states that Weston Road will be reconstructed to 4-lanes; York Region has no plans to implement a widening of Weston Road, and this should not be used as a future build-out improvement for the study. In addition, Pine Valley Drive has been identified as being under the jurisdiction of the Region, however this section belongs to the City.

The Region notes that while the transportation study does not include a contiguous street connection across the TCPL driveway, the Region's preference is to protect for a potential crossing over the TCPL driveway, which would provide an internal connection between the future northerly and southerly neighbourhoods within the Subject Lands.

Sustainable Mobility

York Region is requesting the applicant to protect for and/or construct future multi-use paths ('MUPs') and connections to the MUPs along Weston Road and Teston Road.

Traffic Safety

York Region has identified a number of modifications that are required for the site line assessments submitted in support of the proposed Block Plan application. York Region is also requesting that any new accesses along Teston Road align with the access located in the concession block to the south of the Subject Lands (being Block 40).

Traffic Signal Operations

York Region has reviewed the transportation study and related figures and models, and require a number of modifications in order to support the proposed Block Plan application. Additionally, according to the review of the 2031 capacity analysis, intersections along Weston Road are expected to operate at unacceptable levels of service resulting in significant vehicular delays without a Weston Road widening, which is an upgrade not presently being considered by York Region. Therefore, the proposed development for the 2031 horizon should not be moved forward until a Weston Road widening is built and in place.

The TRCA has identified issues to be addressed through this application

Through the Partnership Memorandum for Planning Services, the TRCA provides plan review and technical clearance services to York Region on matters relating to the natural environment and the natural heritage system. Accordingly, York Region has deferred the evaluation of the natural heritage network and environmental studies to the subject matter experts at the TRCA and the City.

The TRCA also have legislative and regulatory authority to provide comments based on its role as a commenting agency under the *Conservation Authorities Act*; the delegated responsibility of representing the provincial interest on natural hazards encompassed by Section 3.1 of the PPS; regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 166/06, *Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses* ('O. Reg 166/06'); and its role as a resource management agency operating on a local watershed basis.

Accordingly, the TRCA have undertaken a comprehensive review of the first Block Plan submission and note the following matters – which are not exhaustive – that are required to be addressed prior to the approval of the Block Plan application:

General Comments

The Subject Lands contain portions of the Greenbelt, PSWs, unevaluated wetlands, valley corridors, headwater drainage features ('HDFs'), and flood hazards. The natural heritage system ('NHS') on the Subject Lands also includes cool and cold-water aquatic habitats that may support endangered species, such as redbreasted dace.

A significant portion of the Subject Lands is regulated by the TRCA under O. Reg. 166/06, and is subject to the TRCA's Living City Policies. Permits are required from the TRCA for any works within the regulated area, including earth works, site grading and servicing.

Required Studies and Limits of Development Outstanding

During the completion of the related Secondary Plan, TRCA agreed to defer several detailed studies with the understanding that they would be addressed by the MESP required in support of the Block Plan application. The deferred studies included – but are not limited to - the completion of constraints mapping, Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment ('HDFA'), wetland evaluations, an Environmental Impact Study ('EIS'), as well as feature-based water balance, hydraulic assessments, and geotechnical assessments. Additionally, TRCA is seeking to resolve outstanding issues relating to the staking and limits of development and recommends that some of this be completed through site visits.

The extent of the MZO over the Subject Lands generally coincides with the extent of the Protected Countryside pursuant to the Greenbelt Plan; however, it appears that the zoning permissions granted through the MZO extend into existing natural heritage features (such as the PSWs, unevaluated wetlands, HDFs, valley corridors, etc.) and hazards (i.e., the floodplain). The limits of these features cannot be confirmed in the absence of the detailed studies that were required to be submitted as part of the Block Plan application and MESP.

TRCA provided comments to the applicants on the draft ToR for the Block Plan and MESP on March 3, 2021. These comments reiterated the importance of receiving the outstanding studies deferred from the review of the Secondary Plan and the East Purple Creek Subwatershed Study ('SWS').

Development Planning and Permits, and Planning Ecology

TRCA have identified several road segments encroaching into the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan and the NHS. The encroachment of the proposed roadways within the Greenbelt does not appear to support agriculture, recreation, tourism, or rural economic activity; similarly, they do not

appear to provide connections between urban centres and Ontario's borders consistent with Section 4.2 of the Greenbelt Plan. In all these locations, the roads are parallel to the Greenbelt limit, and these encroachments do not provide transportation corridor functions for connecting communities. They push infrastructure into the Greenbelt to directly facilitate development. As reasonable alternative locations exist for these roads – outside the Greenbelt – they are not appropriate. TRCA is requesting the removal of these roads from the Greenbelt and any features and buffers within it.

It is understood that the allowance of active park uses within the Greenbelt is permitted by MMAH's approval of YROP 2021; however, active park uses are being proposed directly within natural heritage features, hazards and their associated buffers. Active park uses and facilities must be removed from features and the appropriate setbacks applied as required. Where possible, TRCA would be supportive of maintaining existing tree cover within active parklands. TRCA is also seeking confirmation that the City is supportive of SWM facilities within park lands.

TRCA is seeking to protect and limit disturbance and interference through all phases of construction; in several locations grading is proposed within the features and its buffers. Please revise plans to avoid all grading within the features, hazards and their associated buffers.

TRCA seeks to discourage the establishment of invasive species – more specifically, longer hydroperiods and greater water depths discourages the establishment of local species, and could foster the establishment of undesirable species. The proposed VPZs should have a planting approach that fully distributes cover, as better distribution allows plantings to disperse and sucker, giving these areas a better chance against invasive species.

TRCA is seeking rationale and justification relating to the removal some of the wetlands outside the Greenbelt.

Geotechnical and Water Resource Engineering

TRCA have identified a number of revisions required to the engineering drawings and reports submitted in support of the Block Plan application and MESP. TRCA also note several analyses should be revised to reflect approaches within the SWS.

The applicants are proposing outfalls and headwalls within the SWM ponds that encroach into the long-term stable top-of-slope and discharge onto the slope.

The discharge by the outfall/headwall on the slope can aggravate slope stability issues and will increase the risk of further erosion and slope instability. Additional mitigative measures will be required to avoid further erosion by the discharge, which aggravate the slope stability issues.

Outstanding Fees

The applicants have provided 70% the prescribed review fee pursuant to the TRCA's fee schedule, in the amount of \$157,897.80, which constitutes the base fee and a portion of the per hectare review and management fee. The final 30% of the review fee, being \$60,844.95, is required prior to final approval of the MESP.

The above issues identified by York Region and the TRCA will be addressed through subsequent submissions of the Block Plan application, and prior to a future technical report being considered.

Conclusion

The preliminary issues identified in this report, and any other issues identified through the processing of the Block Plan, will be considered in the technical review of the application and supporting documents. Comments from the public and the Committee of the Whole expressed at the Public Meeting, or provided in writing, will be addressed in a comprehensive, technical report at a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

For more information, please contact Diana DiGirolamo, Senior Planner, Policy Planning and Special Programs Department, ext. 8776.

Attachments

1. Context and Location Map
2. Land Ownership Map
3. Proposed Block 41 Block Plan
4. MZO for Block 41 - Ontario Reg. 644/20 Map No.249
5. Land Use Schedule, OPA 50 – Block 41 Secondary Plan
6. Lands being considered for removal from Greenbelt Plan Area

Prepared by

Diana DiGirolamo, Senior Planner, ext. 8776

Fausto Filippetto, Senior Manager, Policy Planning and Special Programs, ext. 8699

Christina Bruce, Director, Policy Planning and Special Programs, ext. 8231

Approved by



Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager,
Planning and Growth Management

Reviewed by



Nick Spensieri, City Manager