

# C 3 Communication CW(1) – September 10, 2024 Item No. 8

From: [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
To: [John Bitto](mailto:John.Bitto)  
Subject: FW: [External] VMC SECONDARY PLAN UPDATE – HEIGHTS AND DENSITIES (TRANSMITTAL REPORT)  
Date: Monday, September 9, 2024 11:53:45 AM

From: IRENE FORD [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2024 11:51 AM

To: Clerks@vaughan.ca  
Cc: Todd Coles <Todd.Coles@vaughan.ca>; Council@vaughan.ca; Land Use <landuse@navcanada.ca>; Navcanada Service <service@navcanada.ca>; ZG-Community Engagement <communityengagement@gtaa.com>; Growth Planning Ontario (MMAH) <growthplanning@ontario.ca>  
Subject: [External] VMC SECONDARY PLAN UPDATE – HEIGHTS AND DENSITIES (TRANSMITTAL REPORT)

**CAUTION!** This is an external email. Verify the sender's email address and carefully examine any links or attachments before clicking. If you believe this may be a phishing email, please use the Phish Alert Button.

Clerks,

Please add the following as my comments on Agenda Item 6.8: <https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=179121>

If the decision to allow unlimited heights in the VMC results in forcing NavCan to make operational decisions that result in increased air traffic over the low rise residential to the north, east or west this email serves to document that no public information was provided to determine if this concern was addressed or not. It is not evident if NavCan or the GTAA was consulted as stakeholders. While I appreciate that NavCan reviews development applications over a certain height they are still a commenting agency and have no authority over land use planning decisions. Ergo if the City of Vaughan chooses to ignore NavCan, GTAA concerns there is little they can do but adjust operations.

I would like to remind staff that the new provincial policy statement clearly states in Section 3.4 (2):

*Airports shall be protected from incompatible land uses and development by:*

- a) prohibiting new residential development and other sensitive land uses in areas near airports above 30 NEF/NEP;
- b) considering redevelopment of existing residential uses and other sensitive land uses or infilling of residential and other sensitive land uses in areas above 30 NEF/NEP only if it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the long-term function of the airport; and
- c) prohibiting land uses which may cause a potential aviation safety hazard.

<https://www.ontario.ca/files/2024-08/mmah-provincial-planning-statement-en-2024-08-19.pdf>

The new RNP arrival path has been approved and it is very near the VMC Secondary Plan and possibly within the extension area. Further while departure paths are a set of procedures that do not follow an approved standard flight path. They do nonetheless result in a significant volume of planes flying through Highway 400/407 area and turning north over Highway 400. This creates significant noise over a large area. Due to the NEF being extremely dated (from 2002) it is unclear to me if this could be considered equivalent to the NEF 30. Even if it is not there is a growing concern in the community about changes in the GTAA/Pearson's airport operations and impacts to the Vaughan community especially in Maple and Woodbridge.

I hope that staff will endeavor to understand:

- 1) what a 'potential safety hazard' is considered;
- 2) if the decision to allow unlimited heights is consistent with the new PPS, 2024
- 3) review with Pearson and Transport Canada if the 2002, NEF will be updated and if updated could apply to any of the areas under any current or future protocol

Pearson also projects significant passenger aircraft it seems inevitable that the number of movements, volume and size of planes will continue to increase.

[100 million travellers a year could use Pearson Airport in Mississauga, Ontario by 2037 | 11n5auga](https://www.100milliontravellers.com/100-million-travellers-a-year-could-use-pearson-airport-in-mississauga-ontario-by-2037-11n5auga)

This decision to allow unlimited heights does not seem mindful of Section 3.4 (1) in the provincial policy statement which states:

*Planning for land uses in the vicinity of airports, rail facilities and marine facilities shall be undertaken so that:*

- a) their long-term operation and economic role is protected;

As per the Intergovernmental meeting in which the GTAA presented they are concerned about their ability to operate and asked for municipal support, see slide 8.

## Airport Zoning & Land Use

- Prudent land use planning in the vicinity of airports is crucial to ensuring that operations are not impacted by new developments.
- Recent development proposals represent **a serious risk to airport operations and our supply chains**. High buildings cause serious disruptions to flight paths and reduce ability of planes to come into the airport and could threaten long-haul flights.
- In addition to operational issues, there is a huge economic loss to the regional economy.
- One proposed development in Toronto would require 787-9 Dreamliners to **reduce cargo by 4.4 tonnes** - at an economic cost of **\$533,000 per flight to our region**.
- Working with municipalities to advocate with us for the protection of airport operation and employment lands.



<https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=166666>

As presented in the presentation that I gave there has been a serious influx of complaints in the Vaughan-Woodbridge area.

Vaughan-Woodbridge Riding [Complaints](#) 2023 vs. 2019

- 221% more individuals complaining
- 738% Increase in # of Complaints (15,606 vs 1,862)
- 6th Highest # of Individuals Complaining of all ridings
- 3rd Highest # of Complaints of all ridings
- Comparison Miss.-Malton (houses airport) 55 vs. 45 individuals complaining

<https://pub-vaughan.escibemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=166669>

Growth Planning Ontario,

Please consider these comments submitted proactively for the impending submission and approval of Vaughan's Official Plan.

Regards,  
Irene Ford