

LAND DEVELOPMENT ADVOCACY & LITIGATION

COMMUNICATION C33 ITEM NO. 3 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (PUBLIC MEETING)

January 18, 2022

Michael Melling michaelm@davieshowe.com Direct: 416.263.4515 Main: 416.977.7088 Fax: 416.977.8931

File No. 703328-01

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: Mr. 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 Gatehollow Estates Inc. ("Gatehollow")

We are counsel to Gatehollow, the owner of the lands municipally known as 9681 Islington Avenue. Gatehollow is an Appellant in the Ontario Land Tribunal (the "**Tribunal**") proceeding concerning the New ZBL.

On behalf of Gatehollow, 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 specific concerns 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 how the New ZBL will affect its existing zoning by-law amendment, which was approved in principle pursuant to a settlement and Tribunal Order, but is awaiting finalization. In particular, our client is concerned that the Proposed Amendments do not include official plan amendments in the "Other Approvals" section, do not account for possible future amendments, and continue to impose a 10-year limit on transition 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. The latter indicate 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, s. 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.

### **Related and Future Applications**

The transition provisions seem to allow applications (excluding Official Plan Amendments) that implement a zoning approval to be assessed under 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.

### 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, **DAVIES HOWE LLP** 

### **Michael Melling**

#### MWM: am

- copy: Ms. Wendy Law, Deputy City Manager, Legal and Administrative Services & 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