

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Christine Vigneault](#)
Cc: [Committee of Adjustment](#); [Todd Coles](#); [Council@vaughan.ca](#)
Subject: Re: [External] A291/22 - CofA
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 2:32:48 PM

What I would like is an answer from Planning on how they determined and accepted this application as minor. I'd like to know why a planning decision that already has a by-law variances and tribunal decision is going to CofA for further variances.

To suggest that this is totally at the discretion of Committee, ad-hoc council appointed community members, is highly concerning. Especially given the presentation of information by staff which doesn't even demonstrate a comparison with like units to understand the differences of what's being proposed. Is the expectation that residents figure the comparison out themselves?

Irene

From: [David Harding](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Committee of Adjustment](#); [Todd Coles](#); Council@vaughan.ca; [Christine Vigneault](#)
Subject: RE: [External] A291/22 - CofA
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 4:25:39 PM

Hello Irene,

Thank you for your email. Whether a zoning by-law amendment is approved via Council or the Tribunal's decision, it amends the Zoning By-law, and the Zoning By-law may be varied. As Christine has stated, the Planning Act allows for a person to apply for whatever variances from the Zoning By-law they wish for. The Planning Act also allows for a Committee of Adjustment to make decisions on variance applications.

The Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) is an emerging downtown, and many of the builds are unique. Each variance is evaluated by staff on its own merits. Development proposals within the VMC are subject to other application processes by our VMC Program team, which is the case here. This allows for additional detailed and technical review of matters that fall outside the scope of the Committee of Adjustment. The owner is currently working on a site plan application with the VMC Program team.

David Harding RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner
905-832-8585 extension 8409 | David.Harding@vaughan.ca

City of Vaughan | Development Planning Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1
vaughan.ca



This communication is intended for use by the individual(s) to whom it is specifically addressed. Such communication may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and permanently delete the communication. Thank you for your co-operation.

Ce message s'adresse uniquement aux destinataires visés. Il peut contenir des renseignements confidentiels ou privilégiés. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez en aviser la personne qui l'a expédié et supprimez-le de façon permanente. Je vous remercie de votre coopération.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [David Harding](#)
Cc: [Committee of Adjustment](#); [Todd Coles](#); Council@vaughan.ca; [Christine Vigneault](#)
Subject: Re: [External] A291/22 - CofA
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 4:56:40 PM

I am happy to hear that but still fail to understand how it made it to the CofA agenda (now deferred) in the first place. By the rationale presented below all things are considered minor unless argued not to be by residents who only have 10 days with the information, which is not sufficient time to be properly prepared and to understand the history.

As mentioned below a reduction in amenity space is not minor in the VMC and will directly affect QOL for existing and future residents. If the ratio, proportion or amount of amenity space was spelled out in the tribunal decision I do not understand how Vaughan or Council could approve anything it would have to go to a higher court. Do they already have a variance on the amenity space provision, are they asking for a variance on top of a variance? That's my other concern, b/c it looks as though they already have a by-law variance, which is not attached to the staff report nor easy to find on the City's website.

I'm not going through decisions to try and understand this but nor should I have to. Presenting amenity space as an aggregate, then showing the applicants request on a per unit base does nothing for the reader to understand that it is a 15% reduction in amenity space. Reductions in setbacks are also highly concerning for an area that should have wide, pedestrian friendly sidewalks.

I just had this happen w/ the massive RioCan application that proposed 1788 people & jobs/Ha when the MTSA minimum is 250 people & jobs/Ha. By no means is that # going to be exact but presenting it or understanding that RioCan is proposing to build something at 6x the density than the minimum allows provides much more context to understand the magnitude of the development proposed vs. what we are planning for and what our infrastructure can reasonably manage.

Going forward CofA decisions will not permit 3rd party appeals as per Bill 23. If there are large gaps in what is presented, residents and other groups who have no appeal rights will be frustrated and I suspect complaints about the presentation and communication of information will become more frequent. I do not envy whomever is appointed CofA members this term of Council.

Irene