

**C6
Communication
Council - December 12, 2023
Addendum #2**

From: [Todd Coles](#)
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: [Adelina Bellisario](#)
Subject: Fw: [External] Revoke MZO, TRCA MZO Permits Under Duress & Motions Undermine staff participation at OLT
Date: December-11-23 8:53:51 AM

From: IRENE FORD [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, December 10, 2023 12:20 PM
To: Todd Coles <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>; Minister (MMAH) <minister.mah@ontario.ca>; MECP Minister <minister.mecp@ontario.ca>
Cc: Council@vaughan.ca <Council@vaughan.ca>; Noor Javed <njaved@thestar.ca>; Emma McIntosh <emma.mcintosh@thenarwhal.ca>; Isaac Callan <isaac.callan@globalnews.ca>; Brian Capitao <bcapitao@yrmg.com>; Smartprosperity Info <info@smartprosperity.ca>; Comments <comments@auditor.on.ca>; Wayne Emmerson <wayne.emmerson@york.ca>; Paul Freeman <paul.freeman@york.ca>; council@peelregion.ca <council@peelregion.ca>; John MacKenzie <john.mackenzie@trca.ca>; Ombudsman On Info <info@ombudsman.on.ca>
Subject: [External] Revoke MZO, TRCA MZO Permits Under Duress & Motions Undermine staff participation at OLT

Mr. Coles,

Was this item brought forward directly to Council and boycotted Committee of the Whole. As in hid it and forcing approval at Council, reduced time for the public to find it on the agenda?

The same way our former Mayor had this MZO brought forward during a pandemic, by bringing the developers requests for MZO endorsement to a Council meeting as an addendum?

This staff report should be deferred and all other applications related to this development until such time as Minister Calandra announces if he is revoking any MZOs.

<https://pub-vaughan.escibemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=155461>

Minister Calandra,

No work has started on MZO 156/22 that I am aware of but I have not been that way in sometime. Minister Clark approved this MZO without any regard for natural heritage and in the absence of any consultation with TRCA or First Nations. I am formally asking you to revoke this MZO. The fact that this staff report has come forward as an addendum only adds insult to injury.

I was ignored at my very first deputation ever, when I expressed concerns about the

suitability of development based on the presence of natural heritage features versus the level of impermeable surfaces proposed in the MZO. At the time I didn't even fully appreciate the magnitude of tractor trailer traffic that would be imposed on the community. You need to go personally see the Walmart warehouse and explain to me how this is progress and benefits the community. It's a blight and I bet the warehouse can be seen from space it's so large.

Minister Khanjin,

Last I checked the Minister of MECP along with the Minister of NRM (or whatever it's called now) has authority over the CAA not the other way around. It behooves me to understand how and why TRCA is forced to give permits for MZO's that they otherwise wouldn't as a result of land use permissions approved by the Minister of MAH.

I was horrified to see that the TRCA was forced to give three permits for MZO's on controversial developments all with greenbelt downgrades or removals (Refer to Sections 8.6 Rice Group Caledon, MZO 483/22, 10.2.1 Vaughan, Block 41, MZO 643/20 and 10.2.3 Stouffville MZO 610/20) . All include concerning clause in the minutes. How can this be legal or ethical?

Caledon

"AND WHEREAS TRCA's Board of Directors, in the absence of an approved MZO, would not normally approve of such a permit, but must do so under duress in accordance with the requirements of Provincial legislation;"

"AND WHEREAS TRCA staff, in the absence of an approved MZO, would not normally issue a Permit where there are impacts to the hydrologic function of wetlands on site and where off-site compensation is proposed instead of replicating the area of wetland lost or length of watercourse removed on site;"

Stouffville

"WHEREAS TRCA staff, in the absence of an approved MZO, would normally issue a Permit for the proposed development where it has been demonstrated there will be no impact on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, unstable soil and bedrock, or jeopardize the health or safety of persons or result in the damage or destruction of property;"

Vaughan

"WHEREAS Section 28.0.1 of the Conservation Authorities Act requires that the Authority shall not refuse to grant permission for a development project that has been authorized by a MZO, outside of the Greenbelt Area, under subsection (3) despite, (a) anything in Section 28 or in a regulation made under Section 28, and (b) anything in subsection 3(5) of the Planning Act; and"

Plus a request for this staff report Section 10.5.1 - how can this be legal, let alone ethical. It forces professionals to give approvals against their professional advice.

"THAT staff be directed to report back to the Board of Directors on the inclusion of a clause in future permit approval reports where an MZO has been issued but where staff have identified major issues or concerns present that cannot be fully addressed by conditions but where the legislation requires TRCA to issue a permit"

Refer to items 10.2.1

Silence does not excuse MECP not acting on their legislated responsibilities. Did any of these developments confirm if endangered species benefits are/were needed? Who is responsible for natural heritage protection right now, because TRCA legally can't comment so who in the approval process reviewed compliance with the endangered species protection act, natural heritage protection etc?

Agenda: <https://pub-trca.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=14776>

Minutes: <https://pub-trca.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=14777>

Auditor General, Integrity Commissioner and Ontario Ombudsman,

I cc'd all of you in the event this is relevant to any ongoing investigations.

I would also like to bring to your attention at the end of the TRCA meeting Vaughan Regional Councillor Jackson brought forward a motion that failed (Section 12, RES.#A 140/23) directing TRCA staff to seek Board approval to participate in OLT hearings. That is totally inappropriate and a prime example of motions coming forward at the municipal level that undermine provincial legislation and processes, intentional or not. This is a decision for the tribunal to make not a political decision of a Board or Council. If TRCA or any municipal staff believe they have cause to participate to uphold their provincially legislated responsibilities at an OLT hearing then the tribunal has a process for approving or denying participant status. She brought forward the same motion to York Region Council ([refer to item M.2](#)) who obtusely passed this motion. She has also brought forward numerous other motions that suggest she is fully aware and complacent of a larger vision that isn't shared with the public to facilitate development that is not compliant with legislation in effect today.

Regards
Irene Ford