

From: Clerks@vaughan.ca
To: [Adelina Bellisario](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Request to Defer Ratification – 5850 Langstaff Rd, OP.24.014 / Z.24.031
Date: June-19-25 11:07:44 AM
Attachments: [Request to Defer Ratification – 5850 Langstaff Rd \(OP.24.014 and Z.24.031\).pdf](#)

From: Joe Fleming [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:07 AM
To: Vince Musacchio <Vince.Musacchio@vaughan.ca>
Cc: Clerks@vaughan.ca; Council@vaughan.ca
Subject: [External] Request to Defer Ratification – 5850 Langstaff Rd, OP.24.014 / Z.24.031

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.

Dear Mr. Musacchio,

Please find attached a letter I have prepared regarding the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 5850 Langstaff Road (Files OP.24.014 / Z.24.031).

This letter was drafted following further consultation on the planning and legal aspects of the staff report and its interpretation of the Provincial Planning Statement (2024) and related policy frameworks.

I believe the concerns raised are significant and merit further review before the matter proceeds to ratification. I am hopeful that staff will recommend to Council that the item be deferred at the upcoming meeting so that these policy and process issues can receive the full and careful attention they deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Joe Fleming
Woodbridge

Joe Fleming

■ Milano Avenue

Woodbridge, ON, ■

June 19, 2025

City of Vaughan Office of the City Clerk

2141 Major Mackenzie Drive

Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

Request to Defer Ratification – 5850 Langstaff Rd (OP.24.014 / Z.24.031)

Dear Mayor Del Duca and Members of Council,

I am writing to express my deep disappointment in the decision made at the Committee of the Whole to approve the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the proposed high-density development at 5850 Langstaff Road.

This decision sets a troubling precedent. To my knowledge, this is the first time that Vaughan planning staff have interpreted a **“designated growth area”** as something that can be created within a **site-specific Official Plan Amendment**, rather than through a **comprehensive municipal planning process**. This interpretation appears to contradict both the intent and the structure of the **Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (PPS)**.

The PPS defines designated growth areas in the context of **long-term supply planning**, specifically under **Section 2.4.1(a)**, which requires municipalities to maintain a sufficient supply of **designated and available lands** for residential development. The PPS glossary is clear that these areas must be **“designated in an official plan,”** not defined **retroactively** to justify an application. Using a site-specific amendment to create the designation that then justifies the same development is a clear example of **circular logic**.

This issue has been addressed at the **Ontario Land Tribunal**:

- In **Buchheit v. Barrie (PL180671)**, the Tribunal rejected a similar claim that urban boundary inclusion alone qualifies a site as a designated growth area, affirming that such a designation must **already exist** in the Official Plan.
- In **5400 Yonge Holdings v. Toronto (PL180686)**, the Tribunal criticized the use of **circular reasoning** when planning staff modified policy to justify a proposal, and then used that same modification as the rationale for approval.

I understand that staff may cite **Bill 185** or the **PPS 2024** to justify the flexibility to designate growth areas through a site-specific amendment. However, neither provides the authority to redefine core policy principles in this way:

- **Bill 185** expands appeal rights **but does not change the planning tests** that apply to Official Plan conformity.

- The **PPS 2024**, while streamlined, continues to define designated growth areas as **lands identified in an Official Plan**, not just any land within a settlement area.
- If staff or the developer claim that the **PPS 2024** allows this approach, they are misinterpreting it in a way that undermines both **Section 2.1.6** (supporting complete communities through appropriate land use planning) and **Section 2.3.1**, which emphasizes **focusing growth in strategic growth areas**, including those identified in advance through comprehensive planning and **not through site-specific amendments**.

Adding to the confusion, the most recent **draft of the Vaughan Official Plan 2025**, which reflects Planning staff's own vision for the city, continues to designate this site as **"Low-Rise Mixed-Use" with a maximum height of 4 storeys**. That is a significant departure from the **34-storey development now proposed**. If this application proceeds, the City will be approving a building over **eight times taller** than the height limit envisioned in its own planning framework.

I recognize the concern that refusing this application may result in an appeal to the OLT by the developer, where the City would need to defend its decision. Approving this application means that **any appeal brought by residents will pit them not just against the developer, but against their own City**, which will use **public funds** to defend a decision that contradicts both community input and the City's long-term planning framework. That is **not a fair burden** to place on a community that has participated in good faith.

I respectfully ask that Council **defer the ratification vote** on this application. These significant policy issues, including PPS conformity, growth area designation, and the implications of Bill 185, deserve proper legal and planning review. This is **not about blocking housing**, but about ensuring that intensification occurs in **a manner consistent with provincial policy and Vaughan's own long-term vision**.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Joe Fleming