

**C120**  
**COMMUNICATION**  
**COUNCIL – October 20, 2021**  
**SP CW- Report No. 48, Item 1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Adelina Bellisario](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Oct 13 Deputation  
**Date:** October-14-21 9:06:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [Oct 13\\_21\\_VaughanCouncil OP IFord Deputation.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** IRENE FORD [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:34 PM  
**To:** Council@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Subject:** [External] Oct 13 Deputation

A copy of my deputation is attached for your reference.

I would have to say that I agree with the women speaking right now about the planes and I have had this conversation with people in Maple and Kleinberg who have noticed more flights, more noise. I have actually recently called the airport b/c a plane was so loud I could hear it over the tv in my living room after 11pm.

Thank you,  
Irene



Oct 13, 2021  
Irene Ford  
Irish Moss Crt.,  
Vaughan, ON [REDACTED]

## **Vaughan Council**

**Re:** STATUTORY INITIATION OF THE VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW 2051, SECTION 26 (3) OF THE PLANNING ACT; AND UPDATE ON THE VAUGHAN OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW INCLUDING TIMELINE, WORKPLAN AND COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

Today I am asking Vaughan Council to ensure the concerns you hear tonight are formally communicated to York Region and to formally support through a motion the Auditor General's value-for-money-audit<sup>1</sup> on the province's land-use planning and growth planning process. I would also ask that Council advocate that no decisions be made, at the Region or otherwise, on forecasted land needs until the Auditor General's report is released later this year.

The process by which the current provincial government has intervened in land use planning across Ontario has been disconcerting. This sentiment is only compounded by the ruling which found Minister Clark acted 'unreasonably and unlawfully'<sup>2</sup> when he did not comply with the public consultation requirements under Ontario's Environmental Bill of Rights regarding MZO legislative changes. What will the Auditor General find in a value-for-money audit on the provincial direction for land-use planning and growth?

I am unable to comment on Vaughan's lower tier official plan without knowing the Region's approved urban boundary expansion. At present if approved the remainder of Vaughan's white belt land 1,210 Ha. will be included in the urban boundary, paved.

Vaughan Council passed a recommendation last June announcing the commencement of the City's Official Plan review and this would include "...an opportunity for public comment on York Region's proposed forecast"<sup>3</sup>. Today's meeting. I see nothing

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-auditor-general-investigating-ontarios-land-use-policies/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ont-mzo-court-1.6169105>

<sup>3</sup> <https://pub-vaughan.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=73599>



supporting this in tonight's presentation. The Region will set the land use designation and urban boundary leaving lower tier municipalities married and committed to whatever is approved by York Region Council. Once land comes into the urban boundary it never comes out, it drives speculation, land values up and undermines the viability of farming on prime farmland. To suggest that public feedback from Vaughan residents will somehow be syphoned back through the lower tier review, this late in the process, is disingenuous and a failure of Vaughan's Mayor and Regional Councillors to engage and represent constituents on matters of regional importance. We were told that we needed a new Regional Councilor next term so we have better representation at the Region but I do not hear any of Vaughan residents' concerns being voiced at the Region.

The York Region staff report on Sept 16 stated: Eight local municipalities provided Council-endorsed positions on proposed forecasts<sup>4</sup>. There was no recommendation or endorsement from the City of Vaughan, proposed forecasts were received and comments provided back to the Region. When I raised this matter in my deputation, I had no support from the Mayor or Regional Councilors.

Even if York Region were to approve the highest intensification scenario of 60% all of Vaughan's white belt lands will become part of the urban boundary. These scenarios

---

### **Recommendations**

1. That staff continue to work with York Region to address priority issues facing the City as discussed in this report, as the Region develops its first draft of the York Region Official Plan;
2. That this report be forwarded to York Region as part of the City's comments on the Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment; and

Item 10  
Page 1 of 12

- 
3. That a Special Committee of the Whole meeting be convened in Fall 2021, to launch the City of Vaughan's Official Plan Review in compliance with Section 26 of the *Planning Act*, and to provide an opportunity for public comment on York Region's proposed forecast.

<sup>4</sup> <https://yorkpublishing.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=25349>

**Eight local municipalities provided Council-endorsed positions on proposed forecasts**



only included community lands, employment lands were excluded and assumed that employment land needs would remain the same. I fail to understand why we need to bring 710Ha of employment land into the 2051 urban boundary in Vaughan when 19 employment conversion requests are currently under review. One of which is the 400 North employment lands which were included by a ROPA justified as necessary to preserve employment land. Most of this land remains undeveloped, almost 10 years later. Recently through MZO approval development has been able to commence.

It is important that Vaughan Council understands even if you choose to adopt a higher intensification target in the lower tier plan if this is not included in the Region's 2051 Official Plan it is meaningless because it will still result in whitebelt lands coming into the urban boundary based on the Region wide intensification target. The greenfield density target in York Region's 2010 Official Plan is 70 people&jobs/Ha but for the land needs exercise they used only 60 and for new secondary plans 65. At some point in this was the direction from York Region Council. Why? Will the City of Vaughan advocate to York Region to use the higher 2010 density target?

The Region's staff report identified that it was BLDG who submitted the technical consultant submission proposing a growth scenario that includes all of East Gwillimbury's whitebelt lands<sup>5</sup>, 700 Ha more than recommended by York Region staff. The most expensive lands in all of York Region to service and with no known waste water solution. As a Vaughan citizen I am not willing to subsidize sprawl in East Gwillimbury, nor should Vaughan Council.

Offsetting, tree planting initiatives will never negate the GHG contributions from the quantum of land use changes being proposed today. The most effective action this Council can take to combat Climate Change is to minimize land use changes, maintain agricultural and natural heritage lands. It is a Climate Emergency, the research and evidence are clear, this summer we have already witnessed the impacts of severe weather, heat waves, fires and flooding. There is a very short window to act and that responsibility falls upon this Council to act.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://yorkpublishing.escrimemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=25349>

In addition to comments received from local municipalities, input on the proposed forecasts has also been received from stakeholders. Comments from BILD request that the Region consider alternative growth scenarios in determining 2051 land needs. Specifically, a consultant technical submission proposed a growth scenario that included the entirety of the East Gwillimbury Whitebelt as urban expansion.



There's nothing in this official plan that benefits existing residents, it will create more car dependence, increase traffic and congestion, which tragically is becoming a matter of public safety for our children; it is an abandonment of representation for your current constituents because it prioritizes infrastructure investment away from your existing communities to greenfield development.

The complaints that you hear from residents about existing developments will not go away if development is directed elsewhere. It will only be more of the same and compound the problems from your existing constituents.