

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, ON
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 Laurier Harbour (Keele) Inc. (“Laurier”)**

We are counsel Laurier, the owner of the lands municipally known as 9785 and 9797 Keele Street (the “**Subject Lands**”). Laurier is an Appellant in the Ontario Land Tribunal (the “**Tribunal**”) proceeding concerning the New ZBL. Laurier’s appeal has been assigned Appeal No. 83.

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

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

Our client’s concerns regarding the Proposed Amendments relate to the effect of the New ZBL on its applications, which have been approved in principle by the Tribunal, but not yet received final approval. In addition, the Proposed Amendments do not account for possible future amendments to its application, the transition rights have a limit of ten years, and Exception 295 is inaccurately applied to the Subject Lands.

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.

Zoning By-law Amendments and Concurrent Applications

The proposed changes in section 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 the 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.

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 section 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.

Technical Amendments

Schedule A to the New ZBL inappropriately applies Exception 295 to parts of the Subject Lands. Such revision to Schedule A should be included as part of the technical revisions being completed.

Conclusion

Laurier has been participating in the ADR process with City staff and looks forward to the opportunity to continue to work toward the satisfactory resolution of these issues.

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 truly,
DAVIES HOWE LLP



Aaron I. Platt
Professional Corporation

AIP: go

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
Mr. Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting
Client