

From: [Bernie Di Vona](#)
To: Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca; [Mario G. Racco](#); [Mario Ferri](#); [Gino Rosati](#); [Rosanna DeFrancesca](#); [IRENE FORD](#); [NADIA MAGARELLI](#); [Frank Mabrucco](#); [Cesare Teodoro](#); [Joe Tauro](#); [Fausto Natarelli](#); [Mike Pascarella](#); [margherita thurlow](#)
Subject: [External] weston 7 secondary plan -committee of the whole (pdf format)
Date: June-04-25 3:59:44 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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.



PINE VALLEY VILLAGE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION • WOODBRIDGE • ONTARIO

June 4, 2025.

City of Vaughan
 Office of the City Clerk
 2141 Major Mackenzie Dr. Vaughan, ON, L6A 1T1

To: clerks@vaughan.ca

RE: Proposed draft new Vaughan Official Plan 2025 applies to all lands to the new Weston 7 Secondary Plan, and the lands that apply to the draft new VMC Secondary Plan.

We are writing, as we understand and recognize the conflicting goal as the City of Vaughan has both obligation and intent to achieve “growth” targets- “more housing faster”- set by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, then allocated to the City of Vaughan, as acknowledged within the Weston 7 Secondary Plan Study, VMC Secondary Study, to accommodate 30 year “growth”.

The tool used by the City of Vaughan is using the “secondary plan” process to deliver the “growth” target. This tool is understood used by each major and/or regional shopping center throughout the GTA as outlined with our prior submission, reverting “commercial”/“retail” or employment lands to “residential high density” without review or understanding the loss or tradeoff of “employment” lands with “residential” fundamental needs for a sustainable community- short term gain at a long term loss in which has not been evaluated or examined with the draft Weston/7 Secondary Plan and contrary and inconsistent with land use policies with “employment” lands needed for a sustainable community.

This scenario is intensified and magnified as the Weston/7 Secondary Plan Study Area includes four major/retail/employment areas and NOT one major/retail/employment block with a Secondary Plan in which is to refine and clarify an Official Plan. The Weston/7 Secondary Plan is precedent setting in size, purpose, or scope, as it refines/clarifies no less than 22 existing Official Plan approved sites.

In our view, the greatest risk to the health, safety, sustainability with the existing community is

the Weston/7 Secondary Plan as it goes to “growth” and not land use planning principles, premature as issues/concerns having been identified by our Association, interested community citizens, businesses (Home Depot) have not been effectively consulted or listened to. For example, the terms of reference with the Weston/7 Secondary plan was to be supported by the Weston/7 Traffic Study as the intersection has been over capacity with “gridlock” identified by Mayor and Council, evaluated to be “most dangerous” intersection throughout York Region, and subject to road design/signalization and movement with the ONLY double/double/double turning lanes found anywhere throughout the Province of Ontario, and proposed “overpass” in which has been deferred- Vaughan Council is failing with the existing community and it would be unbearable, scary , and outright frightening for both the existing community.

Council and Planning is expected to respect the existing community by providing us the opportunity to move towards a “final” Weston 7 Secondary Plan in which is supported by the community, concerned citizens, and businesses to work towards a secondary plan for the next 30 years.

There is no need for the City of Vaughan Council to approve of both the Weston 7 Secondary Plan and the VMC Secondary Plan except for political expediency amidst the lack of transparency in which these matters are brought forth amidst both the community, considered citizens, and businesses all advising the municipality we all have issues/concerns, and they have not been addressed.

For example, the PVVCA submission went towards the request and review by the City of Vaughan Planning Department and Legal Department, towards the appropriateness and legal entitlement to include the northwest quadrant, former Canada lands, in which was precedent setting having federal, provincial, regional, municipal, Ontario Municipal Board, approvals. These approvals understood and recognized the land uses-residential and employment/retail uses, needed for a sustainable community or “well planned community”. What exists is a City of Vaughan approved OP by multi government approvals, and what the Weston7 Secondary Plan, unilaterally has ignored and not reviewed or considered the authority or appropriateness to include the northwest quadrant within the secondary plan permanently eliminating fundamental and essential retail, commercial and employment uses, in which the City of Vaughan had unanimously determined was needed.

RECOMMENDATION

We are asking you to please listen to us- ratepayer associations, concerned citizens, businesses- in which we all understand the challenges in which exist with “growth targets” and “planning” , and request you receive and defer, refer the Weston 7 Secondary Plan to a future Committee of the Whole, following the consultation with parties having identified issues/concerns.

BASIS WITH RECOMMENDATION

The following represents the consolidation of issues/concerns having been introduced by the Pine Valley Community Association with draft plan submissions and outstanding. Our deferral recommendation is understood to be needed as the Weston 7 Secondary Plan is premature and failing to address identifiable issues/concerns:

1. Road/traffic “congestion”, “traffic gridlock”, and “most dangerous” intersection designation. The Weston 7 Traffic Study, terms of reference, was to support the Weston/7 Secondary Plan. The municipality has failed to do so, requiring Mayor Del Duca, to request a deferral with the traffic study. The matter before Council on June 4, 2025, did not have the “final” traffic Study to support the secondary plan.
2. Road/traffic “congestion”, “traffic gridlock”, terms of reference has not identified or evaluated the understanding the intersection is “over capacity”, “accident history”, compliance and conformance with provincial engineering standards. Most notably, the Weston 7 Traffic Study, while it represents a “regional road” has not reviewed and

evaluated the “regional road” road/traffic data or statistics nor evaluated by York Region.

3. Road/traffic volume and movement. The secondary plan has outlined options or requirements such as the overpass, internal north/south road network within the southeast quadrant, RIO CAN, while it is not continuous as under separate ownership. The Secondary Plan has included sites located along Highway 7 in which do not have “regional road” access and denied, i.e., Whitmore Plaza.

4. Road/traffic design. The intersection of Weston and Highway 7 has been constructed in which included an alternative design option resulting in widely understood and considered contrary to provincial engineering standards with a double/double/double traffic movement. Specifically, the engineering recommendation was for an overpass or underpass and both options not having been approved by York Region, i.e. a political decision and not an engineering decision.

5. Road/traffic Network. The comprehensive plan included a ring road system which connects both secondary study areas, east and west of Highway 400. The ring road system has been “deleted” while the volume of traffic vehicles remains unchanged. The Secondary Plan has failed to disclose how the deletion with the “ring road” system impact with development.

6. Total Growth Servicing. Servicing to ensure growth pays for growth and growth is planned or available with a development. The Weston 7 Secondary Plan has not identified servicing requirements to growth over the 30-year period. Further, the community is most frustrated and disappointed, as the VMC Secondary plan also has “growth” approved with identifiable lack of sustainability.

7. Servicing- Stormwater and Flood Control. The secondary plan has included one existing flood control feature only and not included as the property is under separate ownership, within the southeast quadrant. The Secondary Plan does not satisfactorily identify or outline stormwater management or flooding.

8. Secondary Plan Study Area. The northwest quadrant, formerly Canada Lands, in which constitutes by agreement the existing community retail, commercial and residential uses. This request with the Legal Department has not been brought forth to the Planning Department or community.

9. Secondary Plan Study Area-removal of employment lands. We support the inclusion of the retail/commercial sites located on the south side of highway 7 westerly to Whitmore. In doing so, we are of the opinion these lands should not be removed from the York Region Intensification Policies. Staff are to consider this matter as the policies within the Weston 7 Secondary Plan planning implication with all remaining properties along Highway 7 to Pine Valley Drive.

10. Sustainability- Recreation and Culture. The Secondary Plan is requested to review the Recreation Study providing the inventory and availability of parks, recreation, and library.

11. Sustainability-education. The Secondary Plan has included a several school sites proposed within the southeast quadrant, while not having addressed or considered how the “residential” is not family orientated housing. The community supports the need to include “family” housing. As you know, if the school sites are not needed, they will revert to the developer, resulting in more housing or growth on top of growth for growth’s sake.

12. Intensification/Density-“appropriate”. Highway 7 has been the subject to intensification approved by both York Region and the City of Vaughan from Highway 50 to the west and Highway 400 to the east. The guiding principle is for height limits of +/- 10 floors. The Secondary Plan is contrary and inconsistent with the Regional Road Intensification Policies in which have been initiated to address the “gridlock”, “traffic congestion”, lack of “accessibility”. The practice to ask developers how much density they want is worthy of reconsideration.

13. Phasing Growth. While the “draft” Secondary Plan has introduced phasing, we feel it needs to be refined and upgraded to ensure the phases are developed with phase 1 being the southwest quadrant, phase 2 the northeast quadrant, southeast phase 3 quadrant, and, if determined to be appropriate, the northwest quadrant phase 4. Without the phasing fundamental and essential needs for the community would vanish, e.g. grocery stores, personal services, retail stores, etc.

14. Phasing Growth Management. The “draft” Secondary Plan has included the review of growth to the Secondary Plan. We request the policies with growth management be included within a public report and that it be “all inclusive” of growth. As per our prior submissions, growth has been approved and excluded from the “growth target”, e.g., Weston Road northwest commercial sites, Highway 7/Ansley Grove Plaza, Rutherford Road and Velmar and other approved “growth” related projects. The “growth target” should represent the maximum and all-inclusive to ensure and no strain on servicing.

15. Commercial/Business/Employment Use to be compatible with Residential uses. Home Depot and other businesses provide necessary and essential services to the existing and future community. We request you consult further with each existing business having expressed concern with the Secondary Plan.

16. Employment Use with the Secondary Plan. The municipality has recognized the importance employment lands have with the municipality form employment, servicing, and taxes. The Secondary Plan is to be reviewed to determine how the Secondary Plan will ensure the satisfactory level of employment lands.

17. Zoning Standards-Height and Density. The Secondary Plan fails to examine and review compatibility of housing with the existing and proposed communities. The compatibility of housing will also result in a limit to any adverse impact with greater height and density. We consider zoning policies needed for compatibility.

18. Appropriateness- Primary and Secondary Study Areas, i.e. VMC Study area has been recognized to be needed for greater density (east of the 400) and the lands west of 400 to Ansley Grove, were defined and considered to be complimentary and phase in with lower heights and density, as approved by Council.

The Weston/7 Secondary Plan has failed to comply with and conform to the phasing, staging, and development as approved by the Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernie DiVona
President, Pine Valley Village Community Association.