

From: IRENE FORD [REDACTED] >

Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 11:53 AM

To: Clerks@vaughan.ca

Cc: lafrate, Marilyn <Marilyn.lafrate@vaughan.ca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Jackson, Linda <Linda.Jackson@vaughan.ca>; Rosati, Gino <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Ferri, Mario <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Racco, Sandra <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Shefman, Alan <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>

Subject: [External] Jan 26, 2020 1pm Council Meeting Agenda Item 2 (1)

Good Morning,

Please add the below as a communication to Council's Agenda Item 2 (1) entitled: FLEUR DE CAP DEVELOPMENT INC. & CUENCA DEVELOPMENT INC. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FILE Z.20.032 DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION FILE 19T-20V005 10980 JANE STREET VICINITY OF JANE STREET AND TESTON ROAD

I find this entire block very difficult to follow since there are interconnections with infrastructure, stormwater management and relocation of wetlands combined with developments proceeding at different times and only a portion of the developers participating in the Block 34 Plan. On top of this there are MZO's (zoning orders) that affect the development but are not clearly mentioned in staff reports.

Approved MZO [O.Reg.173/20](#) through [MZO endorsement request](#) approved by Council includes multiple municipal addresses on Block 34. Predominately this MZO is for the Walmart Distribution Facility located at 1110 Jane St but also includes lands to the south containing provincially significant wetlands "The subject areas involve three properties, known municipally as **11110 Jane Street, 10520 Jane Street and 3180 Teston Road**, in the City of Vaughan see: [Ontario Regulation 173/20 - Zoning Order in the City of Vaughan | Environmental Registry of Ontario](#). Going forward and in efforts to create more transparency Block 34 developments should reference this approved , clearly more transparency is desired by the public as was evident by the response to the [MZO deputation](#) before Council last week. I would hope that all staff reports with developments that have approved MZO's are referenced.

I believe development on or surrounding these lands would also be subject to the approved ["Permit for activities to achieve an overall benefit for an Endangered Species"](#). Conditions for relocation of wetlands and headwaters are outlined here. I would ask that this permit be referenced in staff reports for Block 34? Can staff reports also clearly identify who is responsible for monitoring and ensuring conditions are satisfied as the development proceeds (province, city, region)? It would be unsatisfactory if there is no third party independent verification and I would not consider the developers paid environmental consultant to be third party independent verification.

I would also like to note that circulation of the public meeting notice on December 23, 2020 is extremely poor timing. Anything distributed this close to the holidays, especially during a pandemic would be easily overlooked. I would hope that timing of public notices is always taken into account by staff and developers when seeking public feedback and input.

I was surprised and concerned to see [Attachment 1](#) showing 11260 and 11424 Jane St with the developers MZO endorsement request in the [Member's Resolution](#) approved by Council but not yet approved by Minister Steve Clark, to my knowledge. After the endorsement it was brought to Council's attention during a meeting on Dec 15 that these lands contain a significant portion of environmentally sensitive lands and the development endorsed by Council (displaying almost the entire site paved) will destroy these natural core features (woodlots, streams, valleys, PSW) and did not offer any compensation/solution. Should this be reflected on Attachment 1 when the zoning order is not approved and significant planning conflicts exist regarding documented core natural features? **Will Council revisit this premature endorsement considering Mayor Bevilacqua's [Member's Resolution](#) failed to provide the full scope of the impacts to natural core features or how they would be protected?**

On Dec 15 Council failed to support a Member's Resolution presented by Councillor Lafrate to signify to the Province that Vaughan Council has significant concerns/does not agree with Bill 229 Schedule 6 changes to the Conservation Authorities Act (CAA). Instead Council used it as a means to attack services provided by the Toronto Region and Conservation Authority (TRCA). Perhaps unnecessarily so because the [Active Development Applications - Update](#) report indicates that only 8% of active applications are waiting for external review versus almost 46% for information from the applicant. **The Block 34 proposed development's use of a MZO is the exact reason why the public is outraged about changes to the CAA and use of MZO's.** No one is protecting and speaking up for the core natural features present on Block 34, this will be compounded if CAA's role and authority is reduced. Already the approved MZO for 11110 Jane Street has permitted and approved the destruction of a provincially significant wetland. It may be argued that the lands lost their ecological function but they have only lost this due to neglect from the developer and Province (as stated by developers environmental consultant letter that highway 400 construction activities contributed to loss of ecological function, this means the Province's contractor was not compliant with the prevention of adverse construction impacts). The lands could have also been remediated and enhanced. I would also remind Council for the lands at 11110 Jane Street there is no document publicly available indicating that the wetlands on this site were officially declassified by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry only reference that it was approved. I hope the document is in someone's file.

Councillors who expressed displeasure with the TRCA at the Dec 15 meeting, I believe whether knowingly or not, were expressing displeasure with the requirements the TRCA places upon developments to preserve and conserve Vaughan's natural core features. I would be surprised if any member of the public expressed these concerns but do think that Councillors would hear this frequently from developers. TRCA is a public body that offers third party independent advice and is the only voice that speaks for natural core features. The process may not be perfect but use of environmental consultants paid by developers is not a replacement and Councillors advocating for this is highly concerning. TRCA has the expertise, resources and knowledge; quite frankly I don't think these services can or should be replaced. To suggest a procurement process for the lowest bidder is alarming and not in the public's best interest to ensure the preservation of Vaughan's natural core features, stormwater and source water protection. **The progression of the Block 34 ongoing and proposed developments exemplifies why the TRCA needs a strong role otherwise Vaughan Council might just pave everything, regardless of land designations.**

It is also concerning to me that Vaughan Council is proceeding to endorse developments that will result in significant traffic increase, particularly heavy vehicles - trailers in advance of the final approval of the EA Report by the Province for the proposed GTA West Corridor/Highway 413. If this highway does not proceed how will local and regional roads manage this traffic, the 400 can only handle so much?

I am not opposed to development, I am opposed to development that does not work with the environment, enhance climate resiliency and protect Vaughan's natural core features and free natural asset management eco-system services. And developments that do not properly consider external development impacts that will be borne and endured by the taxpayers and the public: presence, timing of infrastructure (water/waste water, roads) and community impacts (noise, pollution, health, traffic congestion and safety - How many trailers will be coming and going from that area?).

I hope that Council will be able to incorporate these requests into staff reports going forward to help increase transparency and awareness of the use of MZO's so the public can understand why they have been approved and needed.

Thank you very much for reading and taking my concerns under advisement. I look forward to more transparent and clear staff reports for Block 34.

Sincerely,
Irene Zeppieri