

January 17, 2022

**By E-Mail Only to *clerks@vaughan.ca***

His Worship Mayor Maurizio Bevilacqua and Members of Council  
The Corporation of the City of Vaughan  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive  
Vaughan, Ontario L6A 1T1

**Attention: Todd Coles, City Clerk**

Your Worship and Members of Council:

**Re: Committee of the Whole, January 18, 2022  
City-Wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law 001-2021 (the “New ZBL”)  
Transition Provision Amendments, File No. Z.21.052  
Inconsistencies and Administrative Amendments  
Submission of Mosaik Pinewest Inc. (“Mosaik”)**

We are counsel to Mosaik, who have an interest in lands on the east side of Pine Valley Drive, north of Major Mackenzie Drive and south of Teston Road, legally described as Part of Lot 23, Concession 6, City of Vaughan, Regional Municipality of York and 11, 15, 23 and 27 of Lansdowne Avenue. Mosaik is an Appellant in the Ontario Land Tribunal proceeding concerning the New ZBL.

On behalf of Mosaik, we have reviewed the proposed modifications to the New ZBL, as contained in two separate Staff Reports dated January 18, 2022, respectively addressing transition provisions and technical revisions.

The purpose of this letter is to express our client’s concern regarding the proposed revisions to the transitional provisions of the New ZBL (the “**Proposed Amendments**”).

Our client’s concerns regarding the Proposed Amendments relate to the failure of the City to carry forward its site-specific zoning approval into the New ZBL; the failure of the New ZBL to account for possible future zoning relief; and the ten year limit on transition rights.

### **Site Specific Exemptions**

It appears that s. 1.6.2.6 has been introduced to address situations where site specific approvals have not been addressed by the New ZBL. Problematically, the new clause

fails to account for situations where an exception has been incorrectly transposed into the New By-law.

A provision clarifying that the original site-specific approval prevails in the event of a conflict with the New By-law should be added.

### **Related and Future Applications**

The transition provisions seem to allow applications (excluding Official Plan Amendments) that implement a zoning approval to be assessed under By-law 1-88 (the “**Former ZBL**”) under certain conditions, as provided for in s. 1.6.2.8.1 of the New ZBL.

However, this provision does not function as intended, because building permit applications arising from applications transitioned under s. 1.6.2.8.1 will still be subject to the Former ZBL “as it read on October 20, 2021”. This limiting language is also found in the Preamble to the transition provisions. Furthermore, it is not clear that a minor variance arising from a site plan application intended to implement an existing zoning amendment could “comply” with Zoning By-law 1-88, where compliance is a precondition to the application of 1.6.2.8.1.

### **Ten Year Time Limit**

The proposed revisions in s. 1.6.4.2, which as written repeals the transition provisions of the New ZBL after 10 years, do not address the fundamental problem of indeterminate liability for property owners, and are arbitrary. Our client urges the City to adopt a more measured approach by converting the 10 year sunset date to a *review* of the transition provisions in 10 years.

### **Conclusion**

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and kindly request confirmation of receipt of these written submissions, along with, notice of all future steps in this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Michael Melling  
MWM: al

copy: Ms. Wendy Law, Deputy City Manager, Legal and Administrative Services, and City Solicitor  
Ms. Caterina Facciolo, Deputy City Solicitor, Planning and Real Estate  
Ms. Candace Tashos, Legal Counsel  
Mr. Nick Spensieri, City Manager  
Mr. Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management  
Mr. Brandon Correia, Manager of Special Projects, Planning and Growth Management  
Mr. Elvio Valente, Building Standards, Manager, Zoning Services and Zoning Administrator