

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 Velmar Centre Property Limited (“Velmar”)**

We are counsel to Velmar, the owner of lands located at 4101 Rutherford Road. Velmar is an Appellant in the Ontario Land Tribunal proceeding concerning the New ZBL.

On behalf of Velmar, 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 ensuring its existing zoning application, which was deemed complete on June 13, 2019 and is before the Tribunal as Case No. OLT-21-001045 (along with related Site Plan and Official Plan Amendments), will be recognized under the New ZBL. Additionally, our client is concerned that the Proposed Amendments still maintain a 10 year time limit on transitional rights.

Zoning By-law Amendments and Concurrent Applications

The proposed changes in s. 1.6.3.3.1 do not clarify whether a zoning by-law amendment deemed complete as of October 20, 2021 would amend Zoning By-law 1-88 (the “**Former ZBL**”), or the New ZBL, or both.

If the intent is to amend the Former ZBL, there is a conflict with the Preamble to the transition provisions, which indicates that assessments of transition issues will be determined under the Former ZBL “as it read on October 20, 2021”, which would negate an approval obtained after that date.

There seems to be an intent to allow certain applications that implement a zoning by-law amendment filed on or before October 20, 2021, but not yet approved, to be assessed under the Former ZBL (see s. 1.6.3.3.2). However, that flexibility does not apply where a related application is filed concurrently with a zoning by-law amendment application prior to October 20, 2021, as is the case here.

Furthermore, the flexibility is again negated by the requirement to comply with the Former ZBL “as it read on October 20, 2021”. Similarly, Section 1.6.3.3.5, which allows for approval of applications filed on or before October 20, 2021, omits Official Plan and Site Plan approvals, which should be included, and is also affected by the “as it read on October 20, 2021” issue.

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

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
Ms. Rosemarie Humphries, R.P.P., M.C.I.P., Humphries Planning Group Inc.

MWM: al