



KLM File: P-2172

COMMUNICATION C29  
ITEM NO. 3  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
(PUBLIC MEETING)  
January 18, 2022

64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B  
Concord, Ontario  
L4K 3P3  
T. 905.669.4055  
F. 905.669.0097  
[klmplanning.com](http://klmplanning.com)

January 17, 2022

By E-mail to [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca)

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

**Attention: Todd Coles, City Clerk  
You Worship Mayor Bevilacqua and Members of Council**

**Re: Committee of the Whole – January 18, 2022  
City-Wide Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 001-2021 (“CZBL”)  
Amendment to Transition Provisions City Wide By-law 001-2021, File Z.21.052  
Inconsistencies and Administrative Amendments  
Submission of Prima Vista Estates Inc. (“Prima Vista”) and 840999 Ontario Limited  
(“840”) c/o Gold Park Group**

---

KLM Planning Partners Inc. submits the following on behalf of our client, Prima Vista and 840 c/o Gold Park Group with respect to the above noted matter. We have reviewed the two Committee of the Whole Report and recommendation with respect to the amendments to the above noted items. We continue to express our client’s position that they wish to exclude their lands from the CZBL and remain subject to By-law 1-88 or that site specific exemption or transition provisions are crafted to address our client’s circumstances. Notwithstanding, our concern regarding the proposed amendments relate to the following issues:

- 1) We are concerned that the amendments to transition provisions do not go far enough to address the underlying concerns related to subdivision applications filed prior to adoption of the CZBL and the various Planning Act applications that may be required to fully implement or develop all lots and blocks in the subdivision. For this reason, we continue to express the desire to be excluded from the new CZBL or that site specific exemption or transition provisions are crafted to address our clients circumstances. Zoning compliance is triggered at various stages including registration (which may require re-zonings or variances to address red-line revisions occurring through detailed design or developer or market changes to lotting, etc.), approval of associated site plans, revisions to approved site plans both of which may result in associated minor variances being identified through review or builders desire to seek variances. Furthermore, there are typically further implementing applications that arise related to lots and blocks that require exemption from Part Lot Control for creation of lots, Potl’s, etc., consent to sever and condominium approvals all of which require zoning compliance and from time to time relief through variances or re-zonings. In addition, the building permit process can result in zoning relief being required through the City review or requests being sought by builders to address design issues or unique circumstances that arise. Limiting zoning relief to variances is not sufficient in a potential case

where zoning relief required doesn't meet the tests of a variance. The language should be clear that any minor variances or re-zonings would vary or amend By-law 1-88 as amended and that building permits would be issued provided the application complies with By-law 1-88, as it read at the time of the issuance of the building permit. We believe a separate section under 1.6.3 that allows applicants to rely on By-law 1-88, as amended for subdivision applications filed and deemed complete on or before October 20, 2021 and all subsequent Planning Act applications that may be required and building permits would be appropriate to ensure a smooth transition and certainty in the process.

- 2) S.1.6.2.6. appears to address issues where site specific exceptions have not been included in Section 14. However, it would be appropriate to expand this to also include provisions to ensure that By-law 1-88, as amended prevails in the case of any conflicts that exist with section 14 of the CZBL and the site specific provisions of By-law 1-88, as amended.
- 3) S. 1.6.2.8.1 does seem to allow applications excluding (excluding Official Plan Amendments and Zoning By-law Amendments) filed after October 20, 2021. However, we are concerned that associated s.1.6.2.8.2 would still restrict the issuance of building permits to applications that comply with the provisions of By-law 1-88, as amended as it read on October 20, 2021. This is consistent with the Transition preamble provisions and needs to be revised to avoid negating the approvals. The same concerns arise from the language in s1.6.3.3.1 and s1.6.3.3.2.
- 4) We continue to have concerns with the repealing of the transition provisions after 10 years. Circumstances impacting the rate of development and potential associated delays are unique to all properties and owners and we do not believe that one date will address all. We would request that this be deleted and left to future reviews which could take place in ten years or at least following OP reviews.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and would request that you provide notice of future steps and any future Committee meetings dealing with this issue and look forward to the opportunity to work with staff towards resolving these issues prior to adoption. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

**KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.**



Mark Yarranton, BES, MCIP, RPP  
*PRESIDENT*

Cc: Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning & Growth Management  
Brandon Correia, City of Vaughan  
Graziano Stefani, Gold Park Group  
Gerard Borean, Parente Borean