

**Public/ Landowner Submissions Received by York Region on
Township Council Adopted Version – September 23, 2019
Our King: Township of King Official Plan**

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
Overland LLP on behalf of Stateview Homes (High Crown Estates) October 10, 2019			
1.	13151-13211 Keele Street, King City Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations	<p>We are the lawyers for Stateview Homes (High Crown Estate) Inc. ("Stateview"), the owner of the lands municipally known as 13151-13211 Keele Street (the "Subject Site").</p> <p>We have received notice that the Our King Official Plan (the "King OP") was adopted at the September 23, 2019 meeting of the Township of King (the "Township") Council. We are writing to express our client's objection to the King OP as adopted, and to request notice of the Region's decision regarding the King OP.</p> <p>Background - Site-Specific Applications</p> <p>On August 10, 2018, Stateview submitted development applications including an Official Plan Amendment, for the Subject Site to permit a proposed fifty-six (56) unit townhouse development (File No. OP-2018-03). In December 2018, Stateview presented a revised proposal containing fifty-three (53) townhouse units, and in June 2019, Stateview presented a fifty-two (52) unit proposal. Stateview is currently working on revising the proposed development for the Subject Site to address various concerns of Township staff and the community.</p> <p>Stateview's site-specific development applications were appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal on October 4, 2019 to ensure that a consistent and coherent determination can be made regarding the planning future of the Subject Site.</p> <p>In this context, our client and its representatives had been monitoring the process of the King OP and were generally content with the various drafts, up to the June 2019 draft which was available for public comment over the summer.</p> <p>Proposed Designation in New King OP</p> <p>At the time of Stateview's Official Plan Amendment application, the Subject Site was designated "Existing Low Density Residential Area" by the in-force King City Community Plan (OPA #540). Numerous drafts of the King OP were released in 2018 and 2019, which proposed a "Mixed Use" designation for the Subject Site, which would have permitted the proposed townhouse development without the need for the OPA. Stateview was supportive of this designation, and we had intended to write in general support of the plan, while maintaining our formal right of appeal and/or a basis for future status in appeals by others, to ensure a consistent planning determination for the lands.</p> <p>However, without any prior notice during the Council meeting at which the King OP was adopted on</p>	<p>The site-specific development applications for these lands have been appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT).</p> <p>Upon adoption, Township Council directed changes to the Village Core and Mixed Use designations in King City.</p> <p>No further modifications are proposed by York Region.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>September 23, 2019, and without any supportive planning rationale that we are aware of, Township Council revised the designation of the Subject Site to "Established Neighbourhood", which would effectively prohibit any redevelopment or intensification of the lands. In addition, just prior to the Council meeting, a revised "Natural Heritage" overlay was applied to the Subject Site that is not consistent with site-specific studies and reports that have been carried out for the lands. Stateview submitted correspondence in respect of the "Natural Heritage" overlay to the Township of King on September 20, 2019 (a copy of which is enclosed herein). Stateview had no opportunity to comment on the change to the land use designation, as this was done without notice on the floor of Council.</p> <p>Both the "Natural Heritage" overlay and the "Established Neighbourhood" designation were applied to the Subject Site without prior discussion or consultation with Stateview or its representatives. Stateview's concern with the King OP is that it will frustrate the processing and assessment of the site-specific applications that have been submitted and are now going through the appeal process, and that there is a risk that contradictory planning determinations will be made for these lands.</p> <p>We also note that the Region has forecasted a population of 34,900 for the Township. A report prepared by Watson & Associates in August 2019 concluded that consistent with the Region Official Plan, the Township is forecast to reach 34,900 persons by 2031.</p> <p>Drafts of the King OP prior to September 23, 2019 provided for that population to be distributed as follows:</p> <p>King City serviced area – 15,500</p> <p>Nobleton serviced area - 6,750</p> <p>Schomberg serviced area - 3,100</p> <p>Rural area- 9.550</p> <p>34,900</p> <p>The Subject Site and the properties on the west side of Keele (south of Norman and north of Heritage Park) were removed from the "Mixed-Use" designation and changed to "Established Neighbourhood" in the King OP approved by Township Council. Within the Mixed-Use designation, developments are permitted a maximum FSI of 1.5. The removal of the Subject Site and the lands to the west from the "Mixed-Use" designated lands would likely result in the Township not meeting its population target. The designation of the Subject Site as an "Established Neighbourhood" without redevelopment potential, in our submission, does not represent good planning.</p> <p>To the extent that these revisions to the King OP, and other policies or mapping contained in the plan, would frustrate the development proposal for the Subject Site, Stateview objects thereto, in particular where such policies or mapping have been advanced late in the process and are not supported by any planning rationale or planning opinion.</p> <p>Stateview also has concerns that the last-minute changes to the King OP by Township Council are not in</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>conformity with the Region's Official Plan and population forecasts.</p> <p>Stateview is formally requesting written notice of Region's determination in this matter. Our address for such notice is provided herein. We also request to be notified of any further public meetings, open houses, or other matters related to the King OP.</p>	
N. Elmhirst (October 16, 2019)			
2.	Schedule F1 – Village of King City Transportation Networks	<p>In reviewing the adopted Our King Official Plan I found that Schedule F1 of the Plan incorrectly shows a “potential future linkage” of the Road Network between Keele Street and the western end of Tawes Trail. It was shown as a dashed, orange line in the figure.</p> <p>I subsequently discussed this with Ms. Kristen Harrison and she confirmed that the schedule should have shown the linkage as a dashed, green line indicating “proposed active transportation route” and that the correction to Schedule F1 has already been made. I am writing to ensure that the correction is carried through to the version of the King Official Plan that is presented to the Region for approval.</p> <p>Also, I ask to receive notice of the decision of the Regional Municipality of York with respect to this Township of King Official Plan.</p>	Modification to Schedule F1 – Village of King City Transportation Networks proposed to address comment.
MHBC on behalf of Fandor Homes November 6, 2019			
3.	13711 Keele Street in King City Section 5.6.3 Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations 5.17.1 – V-SSPA-1	<p>On behalf of Fandor Homes (“Fandor”), we are submitting comments on the Township of King’s Draft Official Plan (as adopted on September 23, 2019). Fandor owns lands municipally addressed as 13711 Keele Street in the King City settlement area in the Township of King (hereinafter the “subject lands”).MHBC has met with Staff and has made previous submissions on the Official Plan on behalf of Fandor Homes. One of the main issues expressed in those submissions was the potential ability to provide for further intensification through an increase in density permissions on their property while protecting a large portion of the site for natural heritage. The subject lands represent an isolated opportunity for a higher density development on a Regional Road due to the minimal interface with existing low density residential development. Therefore, any language in the Official Plan that would have the result of reducing density permissions already contemplated and approved previously by OPA 89 is of particular concern. A submission was made by Steve Papaikonomou on September 22, 2019 relative to a concern that the latest version of the OP (as adopted on September 23, 2019) (‘Draft OP’) could be interpreted in a manner that could result in a reduction of density permissions beyond what was contemplated and approved by OPA 89. While we agree with and endorse the concerns raised by Mr Papaikonomou, we also agree that some additional ‘tweaking’ of language in the OP under Section 5.6.3 can provide the clarification needed to resolve this issue. Furthermore, in speaking with Township Staff, it is our understanding that reducing density permissions was certainly not the intent of the OP (as adopted) and that Staff are open to further dialogue with Mr. Papaikonomou and Fandor on how best to address this issue.</p> <p>Summary of Issue Fandor’s lands, approximately 9.95 ha (24.58 acres) in size, are located on the southeast corner of Keele Street and 15th Sideroad (see Figure 1), and are included within the King City Community Plan (‘subject lands’).The subject lands are generally designated as Low Density Residential 5 Area within the current Official Plan. A significant portion of the lands (38.02%) are designated Environmental Protection. In 2016, OPA 89 set out that the lands would be developed at an average gross density of 7.0 units per hectare. The current Official Plan defines gross density as “the area of land including the lot area,</p>	Modification 200. proposed to address comment removing the subject lands from the Village Site Specific Policy Area 1 on Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations.

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>local and collector streets, parks, including trails, public schools, institutional uses and all environmental lands with the exception of lands designated Environmental Protection Area on Schedules “A” and “C”. When OPA 89 was approved, the Fandor lands had a developable area of 6.81 hectares in accordance with Schedule A and C. Based on this definition and assuming a gross density of 7.0 units per hectare, this equated to 47 units. Since the approval of OPA 89, a road widening was taken from the subject lands along both Keele and 15th Sideroad, reducing the developable area from 6.8 ha to 6.4 ha. The definition of Gross Density is not clear on whether the density originally ‘assumed’ for lands now used for road purposes is transferred to the adjacent lands. If the density from that road widening is not transferred, this would reduce the number of potential units by 3 (from 47 to 44). Furthermore, the draft OP (now adopted) now identifies more ‘Natural Heritage’ lands on Fandor’s property. Additionally, the definition of Gross Density is removed and appears to be replaced with Section 5.6.3(4) of the Draft OP which states: “That lands to be excluded from the density calculation are limited to those lands that are within a natural heritage feature, with the limits of that feature being determined and agreed upon by the Township and all relevant agencies.” This section requires clarity. Although Section 5.6.3(4) does not refer to Schedule D1 of the adopted OP, it reduces the lands designated Neighbourhood from 6.4 ha to 5.7 ha, which could reduce the number of potential units another 4 (from 44 to 40). Firstly, the application of this policy is vague and is not consistent with how gross density is defined in OPA 89.</p> <p>What is Fandor asking?</p> <p>Fandor requires clarity in policy that the new Official Plan continues to provide the same density permissions that were approved through OPA 89. At this time, the language is vague. The policy for this block can be tightened up through a modification before the Region approves a final version. Fandor will continue to be required to protect more environmental land (according to further detailed review). However, Fandor requires that the new Official Plan be clear that the density of 47 units continues to be permitted on the Fandor lands, notwithstanding the new definition of Gross Density, additional lands designated for Environmental Protection on Schedule D1 and notwithstanding the road widening. This approach is consistent with the approvals that were given to the King City East Landowner Group. Fandor requires the new OP to be clear that densities contemplated and approved by OPA 89 continue to apply when Fandor brings forward a development application. OPA 89 has been carried forward into the draft Official Plan under the V-SSPA-1 policies in Section 5.17. However, the definition of Gross Density and how it is defined has fundamentally changed, that has the effect of further reducing density permissions originally deemed appropriate and approved through OPA 89. In this sense, the draft Town OP does not capture the intent of OPA 89 which was a Secondary Plan exercise undertaken for this overall block known as King City East. To some degree, OPA 89 increased density permissions at the time to be more in keeping with greenfield densities contemplated by Provincial and Regional policies. Further, it appears that the draft OP increases the proposed natural heritage system areas and decreases the developable areas on the majority of the properties within the Site Specific Policy Area as shown on Figures 1 and 2. While we agree that appropriate protection of natural heritage features will be required through detailed environmental studies, we do not agree with policy that results in a decrease in the number of units that can be achieved at the approved density of 7.0 units per hectare (an already low density ratio compared to Provincial and Regional Plan policy objectives). In our opinion, the revisions to the Natural Heritage System should not penalize land owners from permissions that were previously deemed appropriate and approved through OPA 89 to fall closer in line with regional and provincial policies. Furthermore, this is not solely an issue for Fandor</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>Homes. Other landowners not included in the King City East Landowners Group submission similarly may be impacted.</p> <p>Recommendations In summary, we make this submission to formally request a meeting with Township Staff and, if appropriate Region Staff, at this time to initiate further discussions to consider modifications to the Draft OP (as adopted) to address the following:</p> <p>1. Add language within the V-SSPA-1 site specific policy which would clearly carry over density permissions deemed appropriate and approved through OPA 89 and allow for the transfer of density permissions from lands conveyed for road widening purposes (since OPA 89 coming into effect);</p>	
<p>MHBC on behalf of S. & L. Papikononou November 12, 2019</p>			
4.	<p>13436 Dufferin Street, King City</p> <p>Section 5.6.3 Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations 5.17.1 – V-SSPA-1</p>	<p>On behalf of Steve and Lora Papaikononou (“Owners”), we are submitting comments on the Township of King’s Draft Official Plan (as adopted on September 23, 2019). The Owners own lands municipally addressed as 13436 Dufferin Street in the King City settlement area in the Township of King (hereinafter the “subject lands”).</p> <p>The Owners have made formal deputations at the Township to submit their concerns and comments on the Official Plan. One of the main issues expressed in those submissions was the ability to preserve density permissions contemplated and approved by OPA 89 policy and schedules. At that time, the Owners communicated that they were seeking to ensure that the new Official Plan can be clearly interpreted so that density yields set out in OPA 89 and how they are calculated are not reduced.</p> <p>In speaking with Township Staff, it is our understanding that reducing density permissions was certainly not the intent of the OP (as adopted) and that Staff are open to further dialogue with the Owners on how best to address this issue.</p> <p>Summary of Issue</p> <p>The Owners’ lands, approximately 1.7419 ha (4.304 acres) in size, are located on the west side of Dufferin Street, approximately 900 m south of 15th Sideroad (see Figure 1), and are included within the King City Community Plan (‘subject lands’).</p> <p>The subject lands are generally designated as Low Density Residential 5 Area and a portion of the lands (9.0%) are designated Environmental Protection within the current Official Plan. In 2016, OPA 89 set out that the lands would be developed at an average gross density of 7.0 units per hectare. The current Official Plan defines gross density as “the area of land including the lot area, local and collector streets, parks, including trails, public schools, institutional uses and all environmental lands with the exception of lands designated Environmental Protection Area on Schedules “A” and “C”. When OPA 89 was approved, the Owners’ lands had a developable area of 1.5849 hectares in accordance with Schedule A and C. Based on this definition and assuming a gross density of 7.0 units per hectare, and population expectations of 2.7 persons per household for townhouses and 3.1 persons per household for single family dwellings, this equated to 11 single units or 12 townhouses.</p> <p>Since the approval of OPA 89, the draft OP has been adopted and now identifies more ‘Natural Heritage’</p>	<p>Modification 200. proposed to address comment removing the subject lands from the Village Site Specific Policy Area 1 on Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>lands on the Owners' property. Additionally, the definition of Gross Density is removed and appears to be replaced with Section 5.6.3(4) of the Draft OP which states: "That lands to be excluded from the density calculation are limited to those lands that are within a natural heritage feature, with the limits of that feature being determined and agreed upon by the Township and all relevant agencies." This section requires clarity and fundamentally changes how density permissions are calculated.</p> <p>Although Section 5.6.3(4) does not refer to Schedule D1 of the adopted OP, this Schedule reduces the lands designated Neighbourhood from 1.58 ha to 0.41 ha, reducing the number of potential single units by 8 (from 11 to 3) and townhouse units by 9 (from 12 to 3) based on the revised Schedule, as shown on Figure 1.</p> <p>Through a modification to the adopted Official Plan, the Owners require clarity in policy that the new Official Plan continues to provide the same density permissions that were approved through OPA 89. At this time, the language is vague and can be interpreted in a manner that significantly reduces density permissions originally contemplated and approved through OPA 89 on the subject lands. The Owners will continue to be required to protect natural heritage features (according to further detailed review). However, at the same time, they want to make sure that the new Official Plan is clear that the density of 11 single units or 12 townhouse units continues to be permitted on their lands. This approach is consistent with the approvals that were given to the King City East Landowner Group.</p> <p>OPA 89 has been carried forward into the draft Official Plan under the V-SSPA-1 policies in Section 5.17. However, the adopted Township OP does not clearly capture the intent of OPA 89, a Secondary Plan exercise undertaken for this overall block known as King City East. To some degree, OPA 89 increased density permissions at the time to be more in keeping with greenfield densities contemplated by Provincial and Regional policies. While we agree that appropriate protection of natural heritage features will be required through detailed environmental studies, we do not agree with policy that results in a decrease in the number of units that can be achieved at the approved density of 7.0 units per hectare (an already low density ratio compared to Provincial and Regional Plan policy objectives). In our opinion, the revisions to the Natural Heritage System should not penalize land owners from permissions that were previously deemed appropriate and approved through OPA 89 to fall closer in line with regional and provincial policies. Furthermore, this is not solely an issue for the Owners. Other landowners not included in the King City East Landowners Group submission similarly may be impacted, as shown on Figure 2.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>In summary, we make this submission to formally request a meeting with Township Staff and, if appropriate Region Staff, at this time to initiate further discussions to consider modifications to the Draft OP (as adopted) to address the following:</p> <p>1. Add language within the V-SSPA-1 site specific policy which would clearly carry over density permissions deemed appropriate and approved through OPA 89</p>	
Loopstra Nixon LLP on behalf of B&D Love Inc. November 12, 2019			
5.	1265 & 1405 19 th Sideroad	We are the solicitors for B&D Love Inc. Our client is the property owner of 1265 & 1405 19th Sideroad in the Township of King, which is undergoing planning applications.	Policies adopted in King OP 2019 address consents for legal or technical purposes and existing uses on

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
	Policy 9.9.2.10	<p>We write regarding the new Our King Official Plan for the Township of King, which was passed by the Township of King on September 23, 2019 and has been submitted to the Regional Municipality of York for approval.</p> <p>Please accept this letter as a formal request for notice of any future events, meetings and statutory meetings, and for copies of any reports, papers, comments or other submissions made either to Region of York or by the Region of York or its staff which deal with the new Our King Official Plan. I also request notice of any decisions with respect to the new Our King Official Plan.</p> <p>On September 23, 2019, we made written submissions to Council regarding our client's concerns with the policies in the new Our King Official Plan, specifically in relation to section 9.2.2.10 of the Official Plan under the consent policies. In general, our client is concerned that the new Our King Official Plan as drafted does not protect or properly reflect the existing and proposed uses of our client's lands.</p> <p>For this reason, please confirm that you will provide us with notice in accordance with our foregoing request.</p>	<p>the Oak Ridges Moraine.</p> <p>Modifications 140. and 194. n) proposed to include defined term "Legal or technical purposes" updated as per PPS 2020.</p>
<p>JKO Planning Services on behalf of E. & T. McCarthy November 13, 2019</p>			
6.	22 & 32 Snowberry Lane, King City	<p>Further to our recent discussion regarding the proposed development located on lands municipally known as 22 and 32 Snowberry Lane in the Township of King, we are graciously requesting that site specific Official Plan Amendment No. 93 (OPA No. 93- attached for your assistance) be formally and properly incorporated within the pending enactment of Our King (new Official Plan). OPA 93 is specific to the subject lands, identified herein, and was recently approved by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (L.P.A.T), formerly the Ontario Municipal Board.</p> <p>PERTINENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION</p> <p>On July 24, 2015 our client submitted applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to obtain planning permission that will consolidate the two properties and facilitate the redevelopment of the two (2) properties for one (1) additional building lot. This proposal was recommended by Township Staff but refused by Council on June 27, 2016. Our client appealed Council's decision for both the OPA and ZBLA. A short time later, our client withdrew the ZBLA appeal because a new comprehensive Zoning By-law was adopted by Council after the appeal was filed, and the L.P.A.T. did not have the authority to amend it. The OPA appeal was heard November 2018. The L.P.A.T. issued its Decision on February 4, 2019 approving OPA 93 in principle, permitting the proposed lot sizes and frontages for the two (2) existing and one (1) new lot.</p> <p>IMPLEMENTATION of the L.P.A.T. DECISION</p> <p>Since then, we have been working with the Township of King Counsel and Staff to finalize OPA 93 so that it can be submitted to the L.P.A.T. for its final Order to be issued. These discussions have been ongoing for the past several months, concurrently with the Township's process of consideration of Our King. In this regard, we (our client and myself) met with Township Staff on September 12, 2019 for a pre-consultation meeting with respect to the pending re-application for the associated Zoning By-law Amendment. At this meeting, we were informed by Township Staff that OPA 93, as ultimately approved by the L.P.A.T., would apply to the reapplication.</p> <p>At that time (prior to the September 23, 2019 approval of Our King, by Township Council), it was our position that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for the subject lands will fully comply with the new "Established Neighbourhood" Designation provisions of Our King, if it was approved in its current form at that time. However, at the September 23, 2019 Council approval of Our King, Township of King Council added Section 5.17.4 (Village Site-Specific Policy Area 4) stipulating that the "minimum lot area shall be 0.81 hectares (2 acres)" which is contrary to the Lot sizes approved by the L. P .A. T. via OPA 93. In this regard, it is our understanding that OPA 93 has not been incorporated in Our King as a site-specific policy area. Based on the history of this proposal, this is not sufficient nor appropriate.</p>	Modification 115. and 201. proposed to address comments.

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>It has been over four (4) years since our client initiated the process of applying for a modest infill development on their Property. During this time, the parent Zoning By-law was changed and now the Official Plan has also been updated. Our client has the right to expect that the L.P.A.T's Decision will be fully respected in Our King. Given the respective timing of adoption and ultimate approval of that document and the issuance of the L.P.A.T final Order, it is apparent that One King needs to explicitly incorporate the provisions of OPA No. 93.</p>	
<p>Overland LLP on behalf of Yellow Horizon Homes Inc. December 4, 2019</p>			
7.	<p>204 Dew Street & Great Heron Court</p> <p>Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designations</p>	<p>We are the lawyers for Yellow Horizon Homes Ltd. ("Yellow Horizon"), the owner of the lands municipally known as 204 Dew Street (the "Subject Site").</p> <p>We have received notice that the Our King Official Plan (the "King OP") was adopted at the September 23, 2019 meeting of the Township of King (the "Township") Council. We are writing to request notice of the Region's decision regarding the King OP.</p> <p>Background - Site-Specific Applications are in Progress</p> <p>On April 4, 2018, Yellow Horizon submitted development applications including an Official Plan Amendment application (OP-2018-02) and a Zoning By-law Amendment Application (Z-2018- 06) to rezone the Subject Site to R1-XX with site specific provisions under Zoning By-law 74-53 and R1C-XX with site specific provisions under Zoning By-law 2017-66 (under appeal), in order to permit the proposed development consisting of five (5) single-detached residential units, accessed by a private condominium road, with a proposed density of 14 units per hectare (the "Proposed Development"). The applications were deemed complete on May 15, 2018. Yellow Horizon is currently working through Township Staff comments with respect to the Proposed Development for the Subject Site.</p> <p>Proposed Designation in New King OP is not Applicable</p> <p>At the time of Yellow Horizon's Official Plan Amendment application, the Subject Site was designated Existing Low Density Residential Area by the in-force King City Community Plan, whereas the King OP designates the Subject Site as Established Neighbourhood. Yellow Horizon's Official Plan Amendment Application seeks a Medium Density Residential Area designation in order to facilitate the Proposed Development on the site. On June 27, 2019, Yellow Horizon's planning consultant, Weston Consulting, provided comments to the Township in respect of the Township's Final Draft Official Plan. A copy of these comments is enclosed herein.</p> <p>Section 5.5, Established Neighbourhood Designation, of the King OP provides policy direction for the replacement of existing housing and the creation of new lots. Specifically, Section 5.5.4 discourages the creation of new lots within this designation except by way of a Zoning By-law Amendment, demonstrating a number of factors. The Subject Site abuts the Village Core and is between two cui-de-sacs. The Subject Site represents a significant opportunity and appropriate location for a medium density development that offers transition between the established low density and rural character of King City to the Village Core. The proposed designation of the Subject Site to Medium Density Residential is also in accordance with the neighbouring subdivision.</p>	<p>Township Planning staff have recommended maintaining the adopted Established Neighbourhood designation for the lands.</p> <p>The site is currently the subject of site-specific development applications, pending completion of a public process and decision</p> <p>No further modifications are proposed.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>In our view, the King OP does not accurately designate the neighbouring subdivision directly to the east of the Subject Site, which was redesignated as Medium Density Residential Area upon approval of Official Plan Amendment Number 88 in 2014. The King OP currently designates the neighbouring subdivision as Established Neighbourhoods. It is our opinion that the King OP should accurately reflect the current neighbourhood character to provide context for future development proposals. The blanket application of the Established Neighbourhoods designation to previously developed neighbourhoods ignores the variation in development patterns and opportunities for further intensification.</p> <p>A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe mandates that Upper Tier municipalities, including York Region, must accommodate 50% intensification within existing Settlement Areas and further within Delineated Built-up Areas following the next Municipal Comprehensive Review ("MCR"). The Region of York is currently undertaking its Official Plan Review process to conform with the updated Provincial policy regime, and it is expected that the Region will desire additional opportunities for growth within existing urban areas, mandating further intensification through the MCR process. In our view, the designation of the Subject Site as Established Neighbourhoods does not conform with provincial policy. A Medium Density Residential Area designation permitting the Proposed Development would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Yellow Horizon is formally requesting written notice of the Region's determination in this matter. Our address for such notice is provided herein. We also request to be notified of any further public meetings, open houses, or other matters related to the King OP.</p>	
<p>Davies Howe on behalf of Capital Power Corporation and York Energy Centre December 9, 2019</p>			
8.	18705, 18735, 18765, 18781 & 18815 Dufferin Street	<p>We are counsel to CPC, which operates the YEC and co-owns five (5) parcels of land municipally known as 18705, 18735, 18765, 18781 and 18815 Dufferin Street (the "Subject Lands"), located in the Township. A map of the Subject Lands is attached for ease of reference.</p> <p>We submit this letter in support of the New KTOP's designation and policies for the Subject Lands, which were adopted by Council for the Township on September 23, 2019.</p> <p>Background In 2009, the then Minister of the Environment approved development of a natural-gas-fired power generation facility on the parcels municipally known as 18765 and 18781 Dufferin Street. On July 29, 2010, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council promulgated O. Reg. 305/10 (the "Regulation"), prescribing the YEC project as an undertaking that is not subject to the Planning Act. In 2012, the Township adopted five (5) Official Plan Amendments (the "OPA's") to establish a policy framework for future development of power generation facilities in the Township as a whole.</p> <p>The YEC appealed those OPA's to the former Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") on the basis that they did not properly acknowledge the Regulation, and that the OPAs would prohibit expansion of the YEC on 18705, 18735, and 18815 Dufferin Street. Only the appeal of OPA 73 (applying to 18815 Dufferin Street) went to a Hearing; during the pre-hearing process, the appeals of the other four OPA's were withdrawn. In 2017, the Board approved a revised version of OPA 73, which permits power generation and related uses on 18815 Dufferin Street. It also approved a mapping notation and text to acknowledge the Regulation.</p> <p>The New KTOP We wrote to the Township on June 27, 2019, to request that the Board-approved policies of OPA 73 be included in the New KTOP. Our client is now satisfied that this has happened in virtue of site-specific Policy 6.12.3, Policy 8.6 - Energy, and "Schedule E - Countryside Land Use Designations". Therefore, our client supports the Region's approval of these Policies and mapping. If the Region considers amending any of them, we ask to be notified immediately.</p>	Noted. No further changes required.

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
S. Draisey January 16, 2020 & February 25, 2020			
9.	Schedule E2 – Hamlet of Laskay	<p>I am a resident of Laskay and am sorry to note that boundaries of Laskay are changing significantly. I mentioned my concerns to King Township planners.</p> <p>Laskay is a historic hamlet, started because it allowed for mills on the East Humber River. It seems our new official plan is changing its center significantly, to the point it barely includes the river at all. No doubt it's something to do with proposed local development, but I don't quite see how. Just wanted to mention that at least some of us see it as sad.</p>	<p>Lands surrounding the Hamlet of Laskay will continue to support the rural character of the Hamlet. The limits of the Hamlet extend down to the Humber River in the South.</p> <p>No modifications proposed.</p>
KLM Planning on behalf of Argo Lumber Inc. January 23, 2020			
10.	<p>13130 Dufferin Street, King City</p> <p>Schedule C – Natural Heritage System Schedule C1 – Woodlands Schedule D1 – Village of King City Land Use Designation</p>	<p>On behalf of our client, Argo Lumber Inc. (the "Owner"), we are pleased to submit the enclosed Natural Heritage System Opinion Letter, prepared by Palmer Environmental Consulting Group, containing the results of a woodland assessment conducted at the above-noted lands (the "Subject Lands") in the Township of King.</p> <p>It is our understanding that a small treed area located at the northeast portion of the Subject Lands has been recently identified as a Woodland within the Township of King's final draft Official Plan (the "Draft OP") as part of the Township's "Natural Heritage System". This isolated treed area is adjacent to Dufferin Street and is subject to impacts from future road widening. We understand that the Woodland designation was a late addition to the Draft OP schedules, therefore we did not have an opportunity to comment on the matter. Since then, Palmer Environmental Consulting Group was hired by our client to conduct a physical review of the treed area, which we do not believe meets the criteria to qualify as a Woodland, as is explained in the enclosed Opinion Letter.</p> <p>Although we recognize that the Draft OP policies will allow for delineation of Natural Heritage System features through development applications, we respectfully request that Staff consider the enclosed environmental assessment supporting the removal of the Woodland designation at this time. We ask that the Region and Township remove the designation through a modification to the schedules. We look forward to Staff's response.</p>	<p>Mapping of key natural heritage features was based on data available at the time of completing the schedules. The adopted Official Plan contains policies to address refinements to the Natural Heritage System, without an amendment to the Plan, as confirmed by a Natural Heritage Evaluation.</p> <p>Reviewing the extent of features in the Natural Heritage System at the time of a site-specific development application is preferred as it provides an opportunity to review the matter in detail with input from review agencies, such as the Conversation Authority.</p> <p>No modifications proposed.</p>
Weston Consulting on behalf of V. & L. Zigan January 24, 2020			
11.	<p>13610 Concession Road 11</p> <p>Sections 6.4.2.1, 6.3.2.9 & 3.8.4</p>	<p>Weston Consulting has been retained by Vasyl Zigan and Luba Zigan, the registered owners of the property municipally known as 13610 Concession Road 11 in the Township of King (herein referred to as the "subject property"), to prepare and facilitate the necessary planning applications to convert the existing single-detached dwelling into a <i>bed and breakfast establishment</i>. The subject property is legally described as PT LT 10 CON 11 KING PT 4, 65R8747 & PT 1, 65R16440; TOWNSHIP OF KING.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to express support for the Draft Township of King Official Plan (2019) as it applies to the subject property. The subject property is located on the west side of Concession Road 11, north of King Road in the Township of King. The property has a rectangular lot shape and an approximate lot area of 8.1 ha. (20 acres), an approximate lot depth of 635.7m (2,085.6 ft), and an approximate lot frontage of 136.7m (448.5 ft) along Concession Road 11. It is currently occupied by a chalet-style residential dwelling and various natural heritage features. The existing dwelling is bounded by a wooded ravine system to the north, west, and south, and Concession Road 11 to the east. Within the vicinity of the subject property is a single-detached dwelling to the west and an agricultural property to the south.</p> <p>Draft Township of King Official Plan (2019) - Rural Area Designation</p> <p>The Draft Township of King Official Plan (2019) which is before the Region for decision, designates the front portion of the subject property containing the existing dwelling as Rural Area per Schedule D2 - Village of Nobleton Land Use Designations.</p> <p>The Rural Area designation in the Draft OP is intended to promote a diverse, innovative and strong rural economy by enhancing the area's capacity to contribute to the Township's economy through the provision of</p>	Noted. No changes required.

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>goods and services, including value-added products, the sustainable management or use of resources, and tourism.</p> <p>Section 6.4.2.1 of the Draft OP states that all uses permitted in the Agricultural Area under Section 6.3.2 are also permitted within the Rural Area. Section 6.3.2.9 pertaining to the Agricultural Area designation goes on to state that bed and breakfast establishments are permitted on farm and non-farm properties in accordance with Section 3.8.4, which lists criteria for this use.</p> <p>The owners of the subject property have expressed their desire to convert the existing dwelling into a bed and breakfast establishment which will utilize a farm to table experience and we have completed a Pre-Application Meeting with the Township of King for this purpose. This use will rely upon and advertise its local setting as part of its business model, resulting in increased rural tourism. Our review indicates that such a use would be very well suited for this property given its amenities and location. In our opinion, a rezoning to permit this use on the property would conform to the Draft OP. In our opinion also, the policies of the Draft OP for this property conform to the Region's Official Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>We are supportive of the proposed policies that permit bed and breakfast establishments within the Rural Area. We are of the opinion that bed and breakfast establishments are uses which will contribute to the rural economy. The nature of the proposed bed and breakfast establishment for the subject property will ensure that it does not constitute a permanent, sensitive land use that is detrimental to agricultural land uses. We are also supportive of the proposed policies for bed and breakfast establishments under Section 3.8.4. of the Draft OP. The proposed policies communicate a general intent to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and protect guests from natural hazards.</p> <p>We request that the comments contained above be appropriately reviewed and considered as part of the Region's decision on the Draft OP. Weston Consulting respectfully requests to be notified of any future reports, public meetings and decisions in relation to this matter.</p>	
Thorstone Consulting Services Inc. on behalf of various clients January 27, 2020			
12.	Various	Requested meeting to discuss the various submissions made directly to the Township.	Further details were requested by York Region regarding submission and concerns. No response was received; however, Submission 16. Below followed at a later date.
Davies Howe on behalf of Nobleton York February 4, 2020			
13.	Southeast Quadrant of Highway 27 & 15 th Sideroad, Nobleton Population Forecast in Table 1 and associated policies of Section 2.3.2, specifically 2.3.2.3, 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.7 and 2.3.2.8	<p>We are counsel to Nobleton York, the owner of approximately 21 hectares of land located in the southeast quadrant of Highway 27 and 15th Sideroad in Nobleton (the "Subject Lands").</p> <p>Background On September 23, 2019, the Township adopted the OPA. It is currently with the Region for review and approval, which we understand is anticipated in the Spring of 2020. On behalf of Nobleton York, we provided written submissions (collectively, the "NY Submissions") to Township Planning Staff and Council in respect of prior drafts of the OPA (our letters of May 17, 2019, June 26, 2019 and September 20, 2019 are attached for convenience of reference). The OPA does not satisfactorily address the problems raised by our client. Principally, our client remains concerned with the proposed population forecast for Nobleton set out in Table 1, and the associated policies ins. 2.3.2. By way of background, the Subject Lands were the subject of an appeal of the Nobleton Community Plan, Official Plan Amendment No. 57 ("OPA 57"), which was heard and determined in our client's favour by the former Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") in 2016. A copy of the Board's November 10, 2016 (the "Board Decision") is attached.</p> <p>The Board Decision Our client's appeal of OPA 57 was focused on:</p>	<p>The King OP 2019 provides a comprehensive growth management strategy for the Township to the Planning horizon of 2031. The OP identifies that Nobleton is expected to grow to a population of 6,750 persons within the horizon of the Plan. The focus of growth for the Township is the Village of King City to the 2031 Planning horizon. The population forecast for Nobleton is aligned with the existing servicing capacity for the existing water resource recovery facility. There is an Environmental Assessment in progress to explore potential option to provide future capacity. Additional growth will be considered depending on the outcome of the EA and growth forecast being assessed through the MCR.</p> <p>There is an Environmental Assessment underway to assess improvements and provide for growth beyond</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appropriateness of including the Subject Lands for residential uses within the Urban Area boundary of the Nobleton community; and, • The appropriateness of designating additional lands for residential development given the existing capacity of the Nobleton Water Pollution Control Plan (the "WPCP"). <p>The Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accepted Nobleton York's evidence that the Township did not have sufficient designated residential land to support the 2031 forecasted population of 34,900 persons; • found that other opportunities for additional greenfield growth or Settlement Area expansions to satisfy the 2031 residential land needs were limited; • determined that the Subject Lands represented the most viable option to accommodate additional growth to address the shortfall in the Township's land supply for its 2031 population forecast; • decided that the Subject Lands were to be included within the Urban Area boundary of Nobleton in order to ensure a sufficient supply of designated and available residential lands to 2031; • found that, although the Nobleton WPCP did not, at the time, have available servicing capacity, viable engineering solutions exist to increase the capacity of the WPCP in order to service the Subject Lands; and, • decided that a present-day determination of the available capacity of servicing infrastructure is not a pre-requisite to the designation of lands in an Official Plan to meet the growth requirements over a long-term planning horizon. <p>The Problem</p> <p>As previously outlined in the NY Submissions, the OPA is inconsistent with the Board Decision with respect to (a) the residential land supply; and (b) servicing capacity.</p> <p>Residential Land Supply and Land Needs Assessment</p> <p>The OPA limits the 2031 population for Nobleton to 6,750 persons based on the current servicing capacity of the Nobleton WPCP, and not on a proper land budget and residential land needs assessment. (We note as an aside that the population forecast in the OPA is even lower than in previous drafts of the Plan, which forecasted a population to 7000 persons.)</p> <p>In addition, s. 2.2.3.7 states of the OPA says that growth in Nobleton is anticipated to be limited over the horizon of the Plan due to servicing constraints, and that lands will not be considered for development until the 2031 - 2041 planning period, subject to a municipal comprehensive review of the York Region Official Plan and the Nobleton Class</p> <p>Environmental Assessment for water and wastewater improvements. The proposed population forecast for Nobleton and associated policies will not allow for the development of the Subject Lands, or for the required residential land to be designated for the 2031 time horizon. This directly contradicts the findings of the Board Decision. In effect, the Township is trying to overrule the Board after losing the Board Hearing.</p> <p>Accordingly, we respectfully request that in its approval review, the Region modify Table 1 contained in s. 2.3.2.3, and the policies contained in ss. 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.7 and 2.3.2.8 to properly reflect the Board Decision.</p> <p>Nobleton Servicing Capacity</p> <p>The Board Decision explicitly found that servicing infrastructure is available in Nobleton, and long-term planning can and should be done prior to identification of the specific means of expansion of the WPCP. The policies contained in Table 1 in s. 2.3.2.3 and the policies in ss. 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.7 and 2.3.2.8 attempt to determine or cap the 2031 population forecast for Nobleton based solely on current servicing capacity limits. In addition to directly contradicting the Board Decision in this respect, this does not represent good planning, is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and does not conform with A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019.</p> <p>Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Region modify the above-noted policies to remove reference to current servicing capacity limits.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In addition to the requests above, we ask that the Region review and consider the additional comments outlined in the NY Submissions.</p> <p>Our client's requests are time-sensitive because, on September 20, 2019, our client's consultants submitted</p>	<p>the 2031 horizon in Nobleton, subject to the ongoing Regional MCR.</p> <p>Future population allocation for the Village of Nobleton will be re-evaluated by the Township upon the completion of the Region's MCR process.</p> <p>The Township receives growth forecasts from York Region. Upon completion of the Municipal Comprehensive Review, the Township will update the local Official Plan based on the new planning horizons. The Our King Official Plan conforms to the York Region 2010 Official Plan.</p> <p>No modifications proposed.</p>


Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications to the Township to permit development of the Subject Lands (Municipal File Nos. Z-2019-11 and 19T-19K04). The Township has not yet made a decision on the applications, but they are both in a position to be appealed at any time.	
Weston Consulting on behalf of Kindome Investment Inc. February 4, 2020			
14.	13065 & 13075 Highway 27, Nobleton	<p>Weston Consulting is the planning consultant for Kindome Investments Ltd, the owners of 13065 Highway 27 (Parcel 2) and 13075 Highway 27 (Parcel 1) in the Township of King (herein referred to as the "subject lands).</p> <p>The subject lands are located on the east side of Highway 27, south of Norman Avenue in King Township. Parcel 1 has an approximate area of 2,018 m² (21,721 ft²), an approximate lot depth of 101 m (330 ft), and an approximate lot frontage of 21.4 m (70.3 ft) along Highway 27. Parcel 2 has an approximate area of 3071 m² (33,056 ft²), an approximate lot depth of 101 m (330 ft), and an approximate lot frontage of 40.3 m (132 ft) along Highway 27. The subject lands are currently occupied by a 1-storey detached dwelling (Parcel 1) and a 1-storey commercial plaza (Parcel 2) which maintain frontage along Highway 27.</p> <p>The subject lands are currently bounded by single-detached dwellings to the east; a mix of 1 to 3-storey residential and commercial buildings to the south; a 2-storey commercial plaza to the north; and Highway 27 to the west.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide feedback on the Township of King's Council Approved Draft Official Plan - Our King ("Draft OP") dated September 2019, which will be considered by Regional Council in April 2020. It is our understanding that the Township has initiated this Official Plan Review process to update the current Township of King Official Plan (1970) in order to more accurately reflect the Township's Schomberg (OPA 47), Nobleton (OPA 57), and King City (OPA 54) Community Plans. The Draft OP has been prepared to guide land use planning decisions in the Township of King to the 2031 planning horizon.</p> <p>The subject lands are designated as Village Core per Schedule A (Land Use) of the 2005 Official Plan, and will remain designated as Village Core per Schedule D2 (Village of Nobleton Land Use Designations) of the Draft OP.</p> <p>Our review of the Draft Official Plan has identified a number of policy changes affecting the Village Core land use designation and heritage preservation (Section 3.7.4.3), which will impact future development on the subject lands:</p> <p>5.4 Village Core Designation</p> <p>The village cores of King City, Nobleton and Schomberg are the focal points of commercial and mixed-use activity within the three village, and reflect the overall vitality of the surrounding communities.</p> <p>5.4. 1 Objectives</p> <p>It is the objective of the Village Core to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide for a wide range of commercial, residential, institutional, and complementary uses in a compact form, contributing to a vibrant "main street" feel. 2. Ensure that development complements and supports the historic character of the Village Cores. 3. Encourage the conservation of historic built form and cultural heritage resources, which are concentrated in our Village Cores. 4. Encourage intensification in the Village Cores, in a manner that ensures intensification is compatible with the small-scale Village character and is compatible with adjacent land uses. 5. Continually support the ongoing revitalization of the Village Cores and reinforce their role as the social, economic and cultural focal points of each of the Villages. 6. Ensure that the individual and unique character of each Village Core area is maintained and enhanced 	<p>The conservation and re-use of heritage buildings, sites, and landscapes is an important goal of the Township's adopted Official Plan and contains supporting policies.</p> <p>No modification proposed.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>7. Recognize that development and intensification in the Schomberg Village Core will be limited due to the Special Policy Area.</p> <p>8. Facilitate a creative economy and tourism through the permission of a wide range of complementary uses.</p> <p>9. Provide for an enhanced, predominately pedestrian-oriented public realm with high quality streetscapes, pedestrian amenities, amenities for cyclists and suitable public parking facilities that minimize the need for off-street private parking.</p> <p>Section 5.4.1 facilitates intensification that is compatible with adjacent land uses and respects the historic, mainstreet character of the Village Core. Based on our analysis of Section 5.4.1, the policies contained therein provide sufficient flexibility to facilitate development and intensification on the subject lands. We are supportive of these policies which directly express an intent to revitalize and intensify the Village Core according to the principles of transit-oriented development.</p> <p>5.4.3 Village Core Policies</p> <p>1. That the minimum height for new buildings shall be two functional storeys and the maximum height for new buildings is generally three storeys.</p> <p>2. That development up to six storeys may be permitted, provided:</p> <p>a) The building is located or tiered in height to minimize visual and shadowing impact on streets and public areas, and provides for appropriate transition with adjacent buildings;</p> <p>b) The compatibility of the building with respect to adjacent low-rise residential areas and sensitive uses is addressed through the use of setbacks, buffers, angular plane requirements as well as the sensitive location of windows and balconies to minimize privacy impacts, as detailed in the implementing zoning by-law, detailed design guidelines, and through site plan control; and</p> <p>c) The development does not exceed a floor space index of approximately 2.5, to ensure the density and scale of the development is suitable in the Village context.</p> <p>The intention of Section 5.4.3 is to provide details in how intensification shall be achieved in Nobleton, including establishing a general maximum building height of 3-storeys with the potential of up to 6-storeys in height, provided that negative impacts on surrounding areas are minimized. We are supportive of the policies in this section which provide for flexibility in building height within the Village Core.</p> <p>5.4.3.6 Village Core Policies</p> <p>6. That the following factors shall be considered by the Township in determining whether a proposed development is compatible with existing adjacent low-density residential uses:</p> <p>a) The depth of the lot under consideration;</p> <p>b) The orientation of the abutting lots;</p> <p>c) The height of the proposed building;</p> <p>d) The location and orientation of parking areas and aisles;</p> <p>e) The location and orientation of the dwellings on the abutting lots;</p> <p>f) The height of the existing dwellings on the abutting lots;</p> <p>g) The location and size of the windows in the proposed development;</p> <p>h) The nature of the uses of the yards on the abutting properties;</p> <p>i) The nature and health of the existing trees and the nature and location of proposed trees and vegetation that</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>separate the proposed development from abutting land uses; and,</p> <p>j) The nature and location of existing and proposed fencing.</p> <p>Section 5.4.3.6 addresses how compatibility with adjacent low-density residential uses will be determined within the context of intensification in the Village Core. The policies provide sufficient clarity in determining land use compatibility, and allow for higher-density development and intensification on the subject lands. We are supportive of the omission of language specifically referring to a "predominant building type" in evaluating compatibility with adjacent low-rise residential uses, which will allow for a broader range of building types within the Village Core.</p> <p>5.4.3.9- 5.4.3.9.11 Village Core Policies</p> <p>9. That the provision of adequate and convenient off-street parking is recognized as a necessity in the promotion and enhancement of the Village Cores. To this end, Council shall encourage the coordination of existing parking facilities including the linkage of driveways and lanes for parking purposes. To the extent possible, new parking facilities should be coordinated and linked with existing parking facilities.</p> <p>10. That the Township may consider reducing vehicular parking requirements in the Village Cores where shared parking is possible (on multiple properties and/or via on-street parking).</p> <p>11. That the Township may consider updating the parking provisions of the Zoning By-law to not require additional on-site parking in circumstances where there is a change from one use to another within an existing building or to provide for reduced parking requirements in recognition of transit availability and/or public parking opportunities.</p> <p>The intention of Policies 5.4.3.9 to 5.4.3.11 is to facilitate a transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly public realm by introducing the potential for a reduction the number of parking spaces within the Village Core. It is our opinion that Policies 5.4.3.9 to 5.4.3.11 may help facilitate intensification and higher-density development within the Village Core. We are supportive of these policies that contemplate a potential reduction in parking requirements, which may increase the developable area of lands within the Village Core while decreasing development costs, particularly as the narrow lot fabric within the Village Core is already a limiting factor on its development potential.</p> <p>3. 7.4.3 Heritage Impact Assessments</p> <p>3. To require developers, through subdivision and/or site plan agreements, to incorporate listed heritage buildings or sites where development or redevelopment occurs. All options for on-site retention of designated heritage properties shall be exhausted prior to consideration being given to relocation, in consideration of the Heritage Impact Assessment. The following alternatives shall be given due consideration in order of priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> On-site retention in the original use and integration with the surrounding or new development; On-site retention in an adaptive re-use; Relocation to another site within the same development; and Relocation to another appropriate site within the Township. <p>The purposes of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is to determine the cultural and historical significance of a heritage resource, identify the impacts of a proposed development or alteration on the heritage resource, and recommend a conservation approach to best conserve the heritage resource while avoiding/mitigating any negative impacts to the resource that may result from the proposed development. We are of the opinion that the proposed heritage preservation policies are unduly restrictive while contradicting the purposes of the Heritage Impact Assessment.</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>AHIA recommends the conservation approach and/or mitigation measures to be taken, and does not prioritize any one approach over the other. Furthermore, on-site retention is required and prioritized as a conservation approach in the proposed heritage policies, which may become redundant in the event that an HIA deems a heritage resource to have no cultural or historical significance. We are of the opinion that cumulatively, the requirement and prioritization of on-site retention is an unrealistic expectation from the Township.</p> <p>In addition, greater clarity is needed with regards to the wording in this section, as it is unclear in its distinction between listed vs. designated heritage properties. Section 3.7.4.3 switches between the two terms and is thus unclear whether listed heritage properties also have to be retained prior to consideration being given to relocation.</p> <p>Weston Consulting and Kindome Investments Ltd. would like to reserve the right to provide further comments on the final Township of King Draft Official Plan (Our King) as it relates to the future development of the subject lands, and request to be notified of any future reports, public meetings and decisions in relation to this matter.</p>	
<p>D. Clapp February 25, 2020</p>			
15.	<p>Pottageville Boundary</p> <p>16539, 16555 & 16585. 7th Concession</p>	<p>I have lived on this property for 20 years and I am considering severing off my second house and selling it, If possible. I love this property and want to stay here but am finding the work and maintenance getting to be too much for me, I want to downsize but not leave here. I have also been diagnosed with a serious illness and won't be able to maintain the property in a few years. These are my reasons for my inquiry.</p> <p>From what the Township said yesterday my property is zoned "Hamlet of Pottageville" but is not included on the OP. Is what I believe she said? I am somewhat confused about this. I know the property across the street from me went through this in the not too distant past. One lot was severed off into Three lots address are 16539, 16555, 16585. 7th Concession. From what I saw on the OP these properties run just north of my place, so not sure why my property which is south of these properties would not be included.</p>	<p>Modification 210. proposed to Schedule E1 – Hamlet of Pottageville Land Use Designations to address comment.</p>
<p>Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. on behalf of Nicoletti Family April 30, 2020</p>			
16.	<p>675 Kettleby Road</p>	<p>Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc represents the Nicoletti family who owns lands in the Hamlet of Kettleby located at 675 Kettleby Road and submits this correspondence for the record and to express opposition to the land use policies and designations which apply to the subject property in the Township's New Official plan which was adopted by King Council in September 2019.</p> <p>The Nicoletti family has been actively engaged in the Township Official Plan Review process for the last 3½ years. In addition, the ownership has presented a development concept to the Township for limited residential lot creation through the Pre-Consultation process in early 2019 based on the approved Official Plan policy framework in place at the time.</p> <p>The New OP removes many of the Rural and Hamlet policies which have previously been approved in the Township's Official Plan including OPA 79 in conformity with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Region of York Official Plan and would have allowed for limited development opportunities. These policy changes have been adopted notwithstanding the owner's submissions and requests that the existing approved policy regime be maintained.</p> <p>Accordingly, we object to the Township of King's New Official Plan policies for Kettleby as it applies to the subject property. We submit that these policies do conform to the policies of the Oak Ridges Moraine</p>	<p>The King OP 2019 identifies that Hamlets will accommodate limited growth in the form of infilling in a manner that protects and enhances their unique identities and ensures that they remain distinct from the Township's Villages. Given the amount of land designated as "Hamlet Rural Area" throughout the Township's Hamlets and the limited amount of growth that the Hamlets are anticipated to accommodate, Township Planning staff find it appropriate to consider the location of future development, for uses such as hamlet residential, hamlet commercial and hamlet employment, through site-specific official plan amendment applications. Proposed Modification 129. outlines this approach.</p> <p>No further modifications proposed. .</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>Conservation Plan (2017) and the Region of York's Official Plan both of which provide for and allow limited development with the boundaries of Hamlet Settlement Areas boundaries. It is our request to pursue special policy consideration or a similar approach that maintains current approved policies for the property that would allow for minor development.</p> <p>I have attached our letter of opposition to the Township of King dated April 7, 2020 as well as the Pre-Consultation Notes dated May 6, 2019. My client continues to prepare detailed studies and applications to respond to the Pre-Consultation notes prepared by the Township in May 2019 and is in the process of retaining legal counsel to assist with this matter.</p> <p>On behalf of my client, I would like to request a meeting with Regional Planning Staff to review our submissions on behalf of our clients prior to the Region finalizing its review of the New Official Plan. We would of course welcome the Township's planning staff as part of these discussions. Please contact my office to make arrangements at your earliest convenience.</p> <p><u>April 7, 2020 Letter (Attached) addressed to King Township</u></p> <p>Thorstone Consulting Services has been retained by the owners of 675 Kettleby Road, the Nicoletti family. We have been retained to provide professional planning services, assist with development applications for the property and provide advice as it relates to the ongoing review and approval process for the Township's New Official Plan.</p> <p>Pre-Consultation Application</p> <p>In March 2019, the Nicoletti's attended a Pre-Consultation meeting at the Township to review and discuss a small-scale residential development proposal. The proposal was for the creation of three (3) new residential lots, as a form of infilling/minor rounding out within the Rural Settlement Area (Hamlet of Kettleby).</p> <p>As outlined in the Pre-Con notes issued by the Township (attached), the proposed development is generally consistent with the approved policies under Section 2.4.6 of the Hamlet Secondary Plan (OPA 230 as amended by OPA 79). The applicable policies allow for the creation of up to three new lots subject to a number of policy considerations and the submission of various technical reports and studies which would support the necessary applications to amend the Zoning By-law and associated consent applications.</p> <p>We are currently in the process of assembling a consulting team in order to prepare the required submission documents, reports, and background studies to support the planning applications as set out in the pre-consultation notes. We anticipate completing the necessary work and formalizing the submissions as a "complete application" my mid-2020.</p> <p>"New" Official Plan</p> <p>My client has been actively engaged in the Township Official Plan Review process over the last couple of years. The New Official Plan was adopted by Township Council in September 2019 and is currently under review by the Region of York for approval.</p> <p>Specifically, the ownership has conducted detailed research and made a number of submissions to Township staff, Council and their consultant requesting that the existing land uses permissions as provided</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>in the current Official Plan be carried forward to the New Consolidated Official Plan.</p> <p>Specifically, my client has expressed concerns and objects to the proposed re-designation of the subject property from “ORM Countryside - Rural Settlement Area (Kettleby Hamlet)” to “Hamlet Rural Area” in the adopted New Official Plan. Specifically, the policies of Section 6.2.8 of the New Official Plan that remove permissions for lot creation on the basis of minor infilling and rounding as well as small-scale commercial, industrial, and institutional uses.</p> <p>Request</p> <p>My client has gone to great efforts to prepare and submit a development concept to the Township under the Township’s Pre-Consultation process in early 2019 based on the approved Official Plan policy framework in place at the time. As a result of the Pre-Consultation process, the Nicoletti family has incurred significant costs to pursue the proposed limited development of the property as provided for under the existing Official Plan.</p> <p>The New OP removes many of the Rural and Hamlet policies which have previously been in conformity with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and allows for limited development opportunities. It is our request to pursue special policy consideration for the subject property or a similar approach that maintains the current approved policies for the property and allows for minor development to take place. To this end, we will be approaching the Region of York to discuss this matter with the intent of moving forward with planning applications.</p>	
<p>Dentons on behalf of Flato Developments Inc, and Wyview Group June 12, 2020</p>			
17.	12650 Highway 27 and 13235 10th Concession, Nobleton,	<p>As you know, we are counsel for Flato Developments Inc. and Wyview Group in relation to the above noted matter. Wyview Group is the owner of the lands municipally known as 12650 Highway 27 and 13235 10th Concession (the “Lands”), and Flato Developments Inc. is the development partner.</p> <p>The Highway 27 lands are located on the west side of Highway 27, south of King Road, and immediately south of the existing urban boundary of the Nobleton Community. The 10th Concession lands are located on the east side of 10th Concession, north of King Road, and abutting the existing Nobleton Community urban boundary to the south and east. A map of the Lands is below.</p>  <p>The Lands are designated Towns and Villages in the Region’s Official Plan. They are in the whitebelt, and are designated for future development in provincial plans, as Towns and Villages. The Lands are within the existing settlement area, but are outside of the urban area boundary. The policies of the Region’s Official Plan require that development is contemplated for these lands at the time of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>The recently adopted “Our King” Official Plan, currently under review by the Region, designates the Lands as Nobleton Village Reserve, with small Natural Heritage System areas. The Lands are designated Rural by</p>	<p>The Nobleton Village Reserve is not planned to accommodate urban uses or significant growth in the time horizon of the OP. Over the long term, the Nobleton Village Reserve may provide land to accommodate growth, subject to a future review (including an Environmental Assessment) and amendment to the Plan. It is noted that modifications are proposed by the Township and York Region to the labels of the outer and inner boundaries of Nobleton. The inner boundary is proposed to change from “Village Boundary” to “Nobleton Urban Area Boundary” and the outer boundary is proposed to change from “Nobleton Reserve Area Boundary” to “Village Boundary”. These modifications are consistent with the boundary titles in the Nobleton Community Plan (OPA 57/ 570), the Regional Official Plan, and Provincial Plans which indicate the outer boundary of Nobleton as the settlement area boundary.</p> <p>An Environmental Assessment is underway to explore servicing options only for lands designated within the Urban Area Boundary of Nobleton.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>the Township of King Official Plan (1970), and Agricultural Area by the Nobleton Secondary Plan. The Transportation schedule in the Nobleton Secondary Plan depicts the Lands, in part, as a future by-pass corridor for Highway 27.</p> <p>The Lands are included in the study area for the Region's ongoing Nobleton Water and Wastewater Servicing Environmental Assessment. In this regard, they are opportunely located adjacent to existing development, with proposed road connections to be part of the future development area in the Nobleton Community. The development of the Lands could provide a servicing solution for the surrounding community and address the challenges of the existing out of date septic systems, while optimizing the use of existing services.</p> <p>With the Township Official Plan under review with the Region we request that consideration be made to including these lands in the Nobleton Community urban boundary.</p> <p>Our clients intend to develop a low density residential community on the Lands, including purpose built rental suites for seniors, with appropriate supporting uses. Our clients look forward to continuing their participation in the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review, and request that the Lands be considered for inclusion in the Nobleton Community urban area following the review.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to meet with staff to discuss this proposal, potential servicing benefits, or the Lands in general.</p>	<p>The Township's current Official Plan Review is a conformity exercise with the Region's current 2010 Official Plan, and does not contemplate population forecasts beyond the 2031 Planning horizon. Population growth forecasts for the Township, including for the Village of Nobleton, will be considered following the Region's ongoing Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), and through the Township's next Official Plan conformity exercise to be initiated following the completion of the MCR.</p> <p>No further modifications proposed.</p>
<p>Brutto Consulting June 15, 2020</p>			
18.	25 Laskay Mills Drive, Laskay	<p>Brutto Consulting are the representatives for 'The Owner' of the Subject Property referred to above which is located in the area of the Hamlet of Laskay. More precisely, it is situated between the east end of Laskay Mills Drive and west of Highway 400 in the Township of King. A location map is attached hereto for reference. See Attachment 1 – Location Map.</p> <p>The Subject Property is 30.47 hectares (75.31 acres) in size and rectangular in shape. The property has a frontage along Highway 400 of approximately 405 metres (1328.77 feet) and a depth of 743.5 metres (2439.40 feet). See Attachment 2 – Site Dimensions.</p> <p>Brutto Consulting has been representing the owner of the Subject Lands throughout the Township Official Plan Review. We have also previously provided a Letter dated August 19th, 2019, see Attachment A for reference, to comment on the draft Official Plan (June 2019) where we requested that the Township reconsider the incorporation of our Client's property within the boundary of the Hamlet of Laskay and its designation for employment uses. As per the approved Official Plan Schedules of September 23, 2019, see Attachment 10, it is our view that our comments have not been considered as 25 Laskay Mills Drive has not only been excluded from the Hamlet boundary but also remains within the "Agricultural Area" designation and "Greenbelt Protected Countryside" overlay.</p> <p>Thus, we have prepared this Planning Justification Report to formally comment on the effects that the proposed land use designation in the new 'Our King' Official Plan (approved September 23rd, 2019) would have in respect of not having designated Employment land at the King Road and Highway 400 node which would include our Client's property. In our previous letter of August 19th, 2019, we expressed our disagreement with the Township's decision to remove the Subject Property from the Hamlet of Laskay boundary and to designate it as an Agricultural area within the Greenbelt Plan in their draft Official Plan of June 2019. See Attachment A – Letter to Township of King regarding Official Plan Review (June 2019 Final Draft) for reference.</p> <p>The purpose of this Justification Report is to reiterate that the Greenbelt Plan does not apply to the Subject Property given its location within the Hamlet of Laskay in the immediate vicinity of the Highway 400 and King Road interchange, which is a major infrastructure and major goods transportation corridor more suitable for employment uses. It is important to note that our Client's property was previously included within the Laskay Hamlet Study Area in "Schedule 3 – Laskay Land Use Plan of the Hamlet Secondary Plan ORMCP Conformity Exercise (OPA 230), which is illustrated in Attachment 3 for reference.</p> <p>We have reviewed the applicable Provincial and Regional policy documents as well as the land use policies</p>	<p>The King OP is the Township's first conformity exercise with the Greenbelt Plan and as such is the Township's opportunity to refine and delineate the boundaries of the Hamlets within the Greenbelt Area. It is noted that in 2003, the Township undertook its Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity exercise in accordance with the Provincial Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, and implementing Plan. This exercise resulted in amendments to the boundaries of the hamlets within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) (Kettleby, Snowball, Pottageville), which were refined to reflect the limits of the hamlet use. Through the development of the OP, the boundaries of Laskay, Pottageville, Ansnorveldt, and Lloydtown were refined. Once refined, expansion to Hamlet boundaries beyond the Greenbelt conformity exercise through this OP review is not currently not permitted by the Growth Plan.</p> <p>In consideration of this submission, York Region received a request for deferral on these lands from the Township of King to allow the Township more time to further review and assess the Township's land needs in the vicinity of King Road and Highway 400 together with the Hamlet boundary in the context of the King OPs purpose and vision to 2031. Following the completion of a review and assessment, and Township Council's endorsement of a preferred land use approach, the Township would be in a position to request a decision on this site-specific deferral.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>and schedules of the 'Our King' Official Plan and have come to the opinion that the proposed land use designation for our Client's property and others within the King Road and Highway 400 node is inconsistent with Provincial and Regional policies and with how other lands adjacent to our Client's property have been designated. The Subject Property should be considered favourably for future employment uses given its prominent location.</p> <p>Applicable Provincial and Regional Land Use Policies</p> <p>The following section of this Report outlines the supporting objectives, guiding principles, and policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (2020), the Growth Plan (2019), and the York Region Official Plan (2010) for the designation of the Subject Property for employment uses.</p> <p>Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020</p> <p>The Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS) provides the overall policy direction on matters of provincial interest and provides the policy foundation for planning and regulating the use and development of land. The PPS applies to all planning and development in Ontario, therefore all matters of land use planning and development in the Province must be consistent with the PPS.</p> <p>The proposed redesignation of the Subject Lands for employment uses would conform specifically to promoting economic and employment opportunities. The applicable policies and how the proposal meet their intent is outlined below.</p> <p>Policy 1.2.1 of the PPS states that planning matters must be dealt with on a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated approach across all levels of municipal government (upper, lower, and single tier) as well as with other of governing bodies and external agencies and boards. This approach shall be used in matters including but not limited to the following subsections of policy 1.2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) managing and promoting growth and development integrated with infrastructure planning. b) economic development strategies. d) infrastructure, multimodal transportation systems, public service facilities, and waste management systems; and g) population, housing, and employment projection based on regional market areas. <p>Additionally, when planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality in consultation with a lower-tier municipality, Policy 1.2.4 of the PPS states the need for upper-tier municipalities to identify and allocate employment projections for lower-tier municipalities. These projections must be based on and informed by provincial policies, plans, and guidelines.</p> <p>Based on these provincial policies we ask that the Region, through their Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), strongly consider the employment potential of the Subject Lands given their prominent location within the Township of King and the Region of York. The Township's Official Plan designations for this site should be reconsidered to give the Township of King an opportunity to reach its employment projections on employment lands that would be geographically competitive in the employment land market place. Adding these lands to the employment land base will provide King Township with an alternative, highly visible, accessible and therefore competitive employment land inventory. At present, King Township does not have this type of employment land to offer to job creating environment friendly employment users.</p> <p>Further, Policy 1.3.1 states that Planning authorities shall promote economic development and competitiveness by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) providing for an appropriate mix and range of employment, institutional, and broader mixed uses to meet long-term needs; b) providing opportunities for a diversified economic base, including maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses, and take into account the needs of existing and future businesses; c) facilitating the conditions for economic investment by identifying strategic sites for investment, monitoring the availability and suitability of employment sites, including market ready sites, and seeking to address potential barriers to investment; d) encouraging compact, mixed-use development that incorporates compatible employment uses to 	<p>As a result of the request from King Township, modification 208. showing these lands as "Deferral 2" on Schedule E – Countryside Land Use Designations is proposed.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>support livable and resilient communities, with consideration of housing policy 1.4; and</p> <p>e) ensuring the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and projected needs.</p> <p>Policy 1.3.2.1 also encourages planning authorities to plan for, protect and preserve employment areas for current and future uses, while ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and projected needs. This is further supported by Policy 1.3.2.6 which indicates that planning authorities shall protect lands in close proximity to major infrastructure corridors and major goods movement facilities. Based on this policy the Subject Lands should be considered for employment uses as they are immediately adjacent to Highway 400, which can be accessed quickly via King Road. The existing infrastructure would allow for the creation of new employment opportunities without incurring additional costs on the Region and Provincial road infrastructure. It is a key consideration for the Region to note that the property immediately north of our Client's property has been included within the Laskay Hamlet boundary and has also been redesignated to a less sensitive land use. There is no difference between our Client's property and the noted property to the north. Please see Attachment 10 – Schedule E2: Hamlet of Laskay land Use Designations for reference.</p> <p>Also, the future employment uses on site can be adequately separated from nearby sensitive land uses. Planning authorities are encouraged by Policy 1.3.2.2 to assess employment areas identified in local Official Plans to ensure they are appropriate for the planned function of the employment area. This area would be suitable for only prestige environmentally compatible employment uses. Employment traffic would not access the proposed employment uses from the residential area of Laskey. Access will be to and from the north along King Road.</p> <p>A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 (Growth Plan) The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019, (Growth Plan) is a long-term plan to manage growth, build complete communities, support economic development, and protect the natural environment. The policies supporting the lands for employment use are outlined below.</p> <p>The Subject Lands are within the “Greenbelt Area” of the Growth Plan, which permits development with Settlement Areas (cities, towns, villages and hamlets). As such, we ask the Region to reincorporate the Subject Lands within the Laskay Hamlet Area boundary as part of their Municipal Comprehensive Review in order to make better use of this key strategic location at the Highway 400 and King Road interchange.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.5.1 subsection (b) states that sufficient land must be made available in appropriate locations and for a variety of employment uses in order to ensure economic development and competitiveness within the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) and to accommodate projected employment growth to the horizon of the Growth Plan. Subsection (d) also states that in order to support economic development and competitiveness, land use planning and economic development goals and strategies must be aligned. Thus, additional lands should be made available in key locations, such as the Highway 400 and King Road gateway, to support current and forecasted employment needs to help promote growth in the GGH.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.5.5 also reiterates the need for municipalities to reserve lands within settlement areas adjacent to major goods movement facilities and corridors, including major highway interchanges such as Highway 400 and King Road, for employment uses including manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, and similar ancillary uses. Although the current Township Official Plan does not designate the Subject property to be within a Settlement area it is key to note that the site was historically within the Laskay Hamlet area as shown on “Schedule 3 – Laskay Land Use Plan” of OPA 230, see Attachment 3.</p> <p>Also, Policy 2.2.5.6 encourages upper-tier municipalities to consult with lower-tier municipalities to designate employment areas in official plans and protect them over the long-term. These employment designations may be incorporated through amendments to the upper and lower tier official plans in advance of the upcoming municipal comprehensive review. As such, we reiterate that the Subject Lands should be reinstated within the boundary of the Laskay Hamlet due to its prominent location at the Highway 400 and King Road interchange. In considering the reinstatement of the Subject Property within the Laskay Hamlet boundary the Region can turn to Policy 2.2.5.7 of the Growth Plan. This policy states that when planning for employment uses municipalities shall:</p> <p>a) prohibit residential uses or other sensitive land uses not associated with the primary employment use,</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>and c) provide an appropriate buffer between employment areas and adjacent non-employment areas to ensure land use compatibility.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, the proposed employment designation will occupy the portion of the Subject Lands immediately adjacent to Highway 400, while a proposed Natural Heritage System designation will create a buffer between the proposed employment lands and the residential area of the Hamlet of Laskay, see Attachment 11 – Proposed Alternative for Schedule E2: Hamlet of Laskay Land Use Designations. It is our opinion that the Subject Lands conform to the Growth Plan policies noted above. The Growth Plan encourages the provision of employment lands in municipalities and especially within key transportation corridors and interchanges which in the case of the Township of King is the Highway 400 and King Road gateway. The proposed employment uses will be prestige and there are many locations along Highway 400 where this has already been successfully achieved.</p> <p>Region of York Official Plan 2010 (YROP) The York Region Official Plan (2010) describes how the Region of York should guide future growth and development while meeting the needs of existing residents and businesses. YROP plan has policies which guide economic, environment and community planning decisions. As well, it helps provide guidance for the nine local municipalities in the Region including the Township of King.</p> <p>The Subject Property is situated within the “Protected Countryside/Hamlet” designation under Map 1: Regional Structure of the York Region Official Plan (YROP), and is also within the Greenbelt Plan Boundary. See Attachment 5 – Map 1: Regional Structure for reference.</p> <p>In our view, this designation limits the economic potential of the site and does not accurately reflect its strategic location. As such, we ask that as part of their Municipal Comprehensive Review the Region consider redesignating the Subject Lands to remove them from the protected countryside and also analyze the opportunity to include the south-west portion of the Highway 400 and King Road interchange as “Strategic Employment Lands”, see Attachment 6 - Township of King Vacant Employment Land Inventory for reference. This would unlock new economic opportunities for the Region of York and the Township of King by taking advantage of a currently underused prominent location. Both Chapter 4 – Economic Vitality and Chapter 7 – Serving Our Population of the YROP (2010) include policies that support this consideration.</p> <p>Section 4.3 – Planning for Employment Lands of Chapter 4 of the YROP recognizes the long-term need to reserve lands for employment opportunities as these are considered to be major drivers of economic prosperity and contain over 50 percent of the jobs in York Region. Therefore, the main objective of Chapter 4 of the YROP is to ensure the Region has a long-term supply and effective planning for employment lands.</p> <p>Policy 4.3.3 recognizes that employment lands are strategic, vital and key economic drivers in the Region, and Policy 4.3.4 requires local municipalities, such as the Township of King, to designate and protect employment lands within their local Official Plans. Policy 4.3.5 further reinforces the need to designate employment lands within local Official Plans in order to protect, maintain, and enhance the long-term viability of employment uses in the Region. Most importantly, Policy 4.3.6 states that the “Strategic Employment Lands” identified on Figure 2 of the YROP, see Attachment 7, must be protected and encourages that local Official Plans designate these lands for employment uses given their strategic immediate proximity to existing or planned 400-series highways.</p> <p>Chapter 7 further promotes the need for lands adjacent to major highway corridors to be used for employment activities. Policy 7.2.69 promotes that Provincial highways and Regional streets be utilized as an interconnected goods movement network that links local municipalities and surrounding areas. Additionally, Policy 7.2.77(b) supports the addition of 400-series highway interchanges and overpasses to provide for an interconnected and efficient system for goods movement.</p> <p>As illustrated on Attachment 7 – Figure 2 York Region Strategic Employment Lands the Subject Property is in a key location and should be considered for employment uses. It is immediately adjacent to</p>	


Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>Highway 400 to the east which can be easily accessed via King Road. This available access to major infrastructure puts the Subject Property in conformity with the Regional policies listed above and would allow for future employment uses to be developed without having the Province and the Region incur additional infrastructure costs.</p> <p>The site is also in the immediate vicinity of the Hamlet of Laskay and was previously within the Hamlet Study Area (OPA230), and is in close proximity to the King City settlement area to the east and to the City of Vaughan-Township of King municipal boundary to the south which is conceptually designated as a “Strategic Employment Land” area. These areas surrounding the Subject Property will experience strong employment growth, which essentially puts the subject site in an increasingly strategic location that will be desirable for future employment opportunities. Thus, the Region should consider the economic potential of the Subject Lands due to its prominent location and immediate access to major infrastructure corridors.</p> <p>‘Our King’ Official Plan Land Use Designation</p> <p>The new ‘Our King’ Official Plan, approved on September 23rd, 2019, has designated the Subject Property at 25 Laskay Mills Drive as “Agricultural Area” and within the “Greenbelt Protected Countryside” (See Attachment 8 – Schedule ‘B’: Provincial Plan Areas and Designations and Attachment 9 - Schedule ‘E’: Countryside Land Use Designations) whereas our proposition seeks an Employment designation. Please refer back to our previous letter, dated August 19th, 2019, to the Township of King in Attachment A.</p> <p>In our view, the “Agricultural Area” land use designation and the “Greenbelt Protected Countryside” overlay applicable to the Subject Property do not address the Township’s and Region’s long-term vision to maintain a supply of potential development lands along Highway 400 for future employment land uses, and with the employment studies undertaken for York Region which indicate a shortfall in employment growth.</p> <p>As previously indicated, the Subject Property is in the immediate vicinity of the King Road and Highway 400 interchange and therefore strategically located to provide King City with new economic opportunities. Providing a supply of future employment lands within this gateway area will enable the Township and the Region to achieve long-term employment targets.</p> <p>Employment Studies and Long-Term Vision</p> <p>The Economic Development Strategy, released by the Township of King in May 2018, advised that the Township needs to create 8,755 jobs (an increase of 120%) by 2041 which is a challenging target to meet considering that the Township has added 3,580 jobs since the year 1998 (See Appendix “A” – p.7 on Attachment B).</p> <p>The Township is also constrained by the Oak Ridges Moraine and the Greenbelt Plan and as such has a limited supply of employment lands available for future growth. The ‘Our King’ Official Plan also suggests that employment growth will mostly occur within the villages of King City, Schomberg and Nobleton, none of which are immediately adjacent to 400 series highways. King City is the closest. The Economic Development Strategy also suggests that King Township will require additional employment lands to have an adequate supply for future employment needs and to meet the Region’s employment projections.</p> <p>As per the Region’s Proposed Employment Conversion Criteria (dated March 7, 2019), the Region of York is projected to grow to 900,000 jobs to the year 2041, which is about 264,000 additional jobs from 2018 (See Attachment C - Proposed Employment Conversion Criteria). Thus, employment areas will continue to play a critical role in ensuring this target is met to ensure the long-term economic development for the Region across all of its municipalities. It should be noted that there is pressure in the Region on maintaining its employment land base. Our request for the subject property is that it be included within the employment land base in a location within King Township that is geographically well positioned.</p> <p>The York Region Vacant Employment Land Report (dated March 2, 2018) was prepared to serve as input to the Region’s Employment Strategy as part of the MCR and to help update of the York Region Official Plan. Table 1 of the Vacant Employment Land Inventory Report shows the status of the vacant and built employment lands as of 2017 (See below). <i>[see original submission for table]</i></p> <p>As per Table 1, King Township has the least amount of vacant employment lands after Newmarket, which since 2013 represents a decrease in available vacant lands. The report further states that 84% of vacant employment lands in the Region are located within 5 km of a 400-series highway and also adds that there is</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>a significant demand for employment lands strategically located near these major transportation corridors. Their highly visible and accessible location for goods movement is highly marketable for major employers. Attachment 6 – Township of King Vacant Employment Land Inventory illustrates the location of the limited number of vacant employment/industrial parcels (as of 2017) within the Township of King. In relation to King Township there are no employment areas along Highway 400. This demonstrates the current finite supply of employment lands in the Township and the need to make additional employment lands available. The Subject Property at King Road and Highway 400 is in a much more prominent location in comparison to the current vacant parcels within the Township.</p> <p>As such, we ask the Region to review and revise the YROP and the ‘Our King’ Official Plan land use schedules to incorporate the Subject Property within the Laskay Hamlet boundary and designate it for Prestige Employment uses.</p> <p>LAND USE PLANNING ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>In our opinion, it would be appropriate to reinstate the Township’s Hamlet Secondary Plan (OPA 230), see Attachment 4 – Schedule ‘D’: Land Use Plan adopted in 1983. This would be consistent with what the Township has done for the properties immediately to the north of our Client’s property. This would represent appropriate and comprehensive long-term planning.</p> <p>Given the land use context described above it is our opinion that “Schedule E2 - Laskay Land Use Plan” as currently proposed will limit the efficient use of land for the Subject Property (Please see Attachment 10). The Land Use “Schedule E2” proposes to adjust the Laskay Hamlet Area Boundary but only on the properties immediately north of the Subject Property. Our Client’s property is not receiving similar consideration even though it is in a key location for employment uses and also exhibits similar planning merits to the lands to the north.</p> <p>Should “Schedule E2” of the ‘Our King’ Official Plan be approved and adopted by the Region, the Subject Lands will remain in the Protected Countryside policies of the Greenbelt Plan and be completely confined to agricultural and rural uses only. This would not be the case for the lands to the north. We concur that the lands to the north be appropriately included within the Laskay Settlement Area as should our Client’s property. There are no discernable planning differences between the two properties. Also, there are no substantive physical differences between the neighbouring lands to the north and our Client’s lands.</p> <p>We also respectfully request that the Region of York, through their Municipal Comprehensive Review, analyze the opportunity to expand the “Strategic Employment Lands” to include the Highway 400 and King Road interchange. This modification would create a major employment competitive advantage for both the Township of King and the Region of York. This strategic land use consideration is supported by the York Region Future Employment Trends Study (May 2019), prepared by Hemson Consulting. See Attachment D - York Region Future Employment Trends Study for reference. Section C, Item 5 on page 56 of this Study states that: “communities that are smaller and more rural in nature will play a more limited role in accommodating new employment growth, including the Township of King... Over time, however, as the available supply of development lands in southern York Region is absorbed these communities will be drawn “closer” to established employment concentrations and demand for employment land will increase. For this reason, maintaining a longer-term supply of potential development lands in these locations is important.” and, “In the short-term, growth in northern York Region and rural communities will be driven by population related employment, including retail trade, professional services, education, municipal government, other public institutions and community services. As the population and resident labour force grows, these locations will become attractive for new industrial-type and some limited office uses over time.”</p> <p>Furthermore, Section A, Item 1 on page 75 states that: “The retention of high-quality greenfield sites in the City of Vaughan and north along Highway 400 will also be important to accommodating growth in logistics, distribution and future manufacturing activities. This potential land supply is a major competitive advantage within the GTHA.”</p> <p>In light of this study, including the four quadrants at the King Road and Highway 400 node as “Strategic Employment Lands” will secure a key location for future employment opportunities as long as it is deemed</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>appropriate by the Township of King and the Regional Municipality of York. As such, the new 'Our King' Official Plan 2019 will determine the land use policies and guidelines for the Subject Property for the coming decades and its potential use for employment purposes must be considered and as part of the Region's MCR. The proposed Employment Uses can be readily serviced in the future by extending water and sanitary sewers along King Road to this area so that it functions as a true employment node. We believe the property is an ideal and desirable location for employment uses. Our proposed Land Use Schedule is attached to this Justification Report (Please see Attachment 11). The intent of our recommended land use designations as illustrated on Attachment 11 is geared to meeting the Regional employment growth targets for the Township of King. In conclusion, it is appropriate in our view to designate the subject property as Employment in both the Region of York Official Plan and the King Township Official Plan. These lands will aid in accommodating future employment growth targets set out by the Province, the Region of York and the Township of King. The Subject Property constitutes an appropriate and desirable area to support future growth, will result in no negative land use impacts, and will take full advantage of existing major infrastructure. Should you require any additional information, please contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience. We look forward to continuing to input to the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p>	
Davies Howe on behalf of Westlin Farms July 8, 2020			
19.	12470 Weston Road	<p>We are counsel to Westlin, the owner of the Subject Property, which consists of approximately 52 ha. (128 ac.) of land located on the west side of Weston Road, directly to the south of the Hamlet of Laskay, north of the Townline with the City of Vaughan ("Vaughan"), and less than two kilometres from Highway 400. The surrounding area contains a mixture of employment, residential, and agricultural uses, as well as Greenbelt lands.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide Westlin's comments prior to approval of Our King.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>On September 23, 2019, the Township adopted Our King. It is currently with the Region for review, and we understand that the Region was to provide modifications to Township Council at its meeting on June 22, 2020.</p> <p>On behalf of Westlin, we provided written submissions to Township Council on the final draft of Our King, which are attached for convenience of reference. The submissions noted that Our King, as adopted by Township Council, did not satisfactorily address the problems raised by our client. Principally, our client remains concerned with the Subject Property's proposed designation of "Agricultural Area", and its removal from the Hamlet of Laskay.</p> <p>The Subject Property is currently designated "Rural Area" by the Township's in-force Official Plan, 1970, as amended by the Township's Hamlet Secondary Plan, Official Plan Amendment No. 23 ("OPA 23"). While the Subject Property was designated "Agricultural Area" by the York Region Official Plan, 2010 (the "YROP10"), this designation is not in force, as it is subject to an outstanding appeal by Westlin.</p> <p>For your assistance, please find attached survey plans showing the Subject Property in relation to the Greenbelt, the current Schedule "D" of OPA No. 23, and excerpts of Vaughan's Block 27 Secondary Plan</p>	<p>Given the outstanding site-specific appeal to the York Region Official Plan, 2010 regarding Maps 1 and 8, particularly the Agricultural Designation for the subject lands, York Region is proposing a Deferral on these lands until the YROP appeal is resolved. Modification 207. showing these lands as "Deferral 1" on Schedule E – Countryside Land Use Designations is proposed.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>that illustrate the location of the future Kirby GO Station.</p> <p>Westlin's Request and Merits</p> <p>For reasons set out in detail below, Westlin respectfully requests that the Subject Property retain its current "Rural Area" designation and be kept within the boundary of the Hamlet of Laskay. Given the existing and planned context, as well as the evolving planning for the surrounding area, the "Agricultural Area" designation and its applicable policies are unduly restrictive, and would not constitute good planning.</p> <p>Surrounding Context</p> <p>The Subject Property is not contiguous with any surrounding agricultural uses, and is too small to sustain an economically-viable farming operation. Further, the "Agricultural Area" designation does not take in account the obvious limitations on agricultural activity imposed by natural heritage constraints and existing employment and residential uses.</p> <p>More than 36 ha. (90 ac.) of the Subject Property, representing over 70% of its area, are located in the "Whitebelt", i.e. outside of both the Greenbelt Plan, 2017 and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2017.</p> <p>The Whitebelt portion of the Subject Property is in close proximity to the Vaughan 400 North Employment Lands, which are planned for development in Regional OPA No. 52 and Vaughan OPA No. 637. They are also nearby to the proposed GTA West Highway Corridor.</p> <p>The YROP10 defines "Rural Area" to include farms, businesses, and existing rural and estate residential developments. In determining whether land is more rural or agricultural in character, the YROP10 directs municipalities to look to the number of rural settlements, soil topography, land use fragmentation, and conflicting uses.</p> <p>Given the proximity of the Subject Property to the Vaughan 400 North Employment Lands, surrounding industrial uses, Highway 400, the GTA West Highway Corridor, and the Hamlet of Laskay, the immediate context is clearly more urban and rural than agricultural. The Subject Property's designation should reflect this reality. And in any event, designating the Subject Property "Rural Area" would not preclude it from being used for any of the agricultural uses that are currently permitted.</p> <p>Agricultural Designation Not Compatible with Future Plans for Area</p> <p>The Subject Property is well-suited to provide for complementary land uses to the emerging new Community Areas in Blocks 27 and 41 in Vaughan, and will be served by the planned Kirby GO Station.</p> <p>Moreover, the more appropriate and balanced mix of land uses permitted by a "Rural Area" designation would complement future plans for the larger area, as are emerging in the preparation of a new Regional Official Plan to replace the YROP10. Among other significant potential changes on the horizon is the inclusion of a new Community Area in Block 42 in Vaughan, which is in very close proximity to the Subject Property.</p> <p>Furthermore, initiatives are proceeding to ensure future servicing infrastructure and capacity for the existing</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>and proposed urban areas to the south. Specifically, the Northeast Vaughan Wastewater and Water Infrastructure Design has been planned to accommodate Whitebelt Lands in this area, and is in the Region's 10-year capital budget with an in-service date of 2028.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We would be grateful for an e-meeting with Regional staff to discuss the foregoing and hopefully assist the Region in finalizing Our King. In any event, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require more information.</p>	
<p>Dentons Canada LLP in behalf of Capobianco and Turner July 24, 2020</p>			
20.	3655 & 3653 Lloydtown-Aurora Road, Kettleby	<p>We are counsel for the Capobianco and Turner family (the "Capobianco Family") in relation to the above noted matter. The Capobianco Family are the owners of the lands municipally known as 3655 & 3653 Lloydtown-Aurora Road (the "Lands"), in the Township of King.</p> <p>The Capobianco Family has owned and occupied the Lands since 1975. Currently, the lands contain two homes, which are occupied by two separate (but related) family units. The homes were constructed in 1876 and 1929. They are on separate servicing (including water, wastewater and hydro) and have separate addresses. The Capobianco Family seeks to sever the Lands for trust and estate planning purposes, so that the Lands can continue to be passed down within the family, to future generations (i.e. the children of the family members who currently occupy the homes). They do not propose any development of the Lands, rather the severance is a technical one, to reflect the existing circumstance. What would otherwise be a straightforward severance is complicated by the Official Plan and Provincial policies applicable to these lands. As such we ask the Region's assistance via a site specific policy in the Our King Official Plan (the "New King OP").</p> <p>The Lands are designated "Agricultural and Rural Areas" in the current Township of King Official Plan. In general, this designation permits agricultural and rural uses. An aerial of the Lands is below.</p>	<p>The adopted King OP 2019 contains policies addressing consents, and technical severances and existing uses on the Oak Ridges Moraine. Proposed modification 140. and 194. n) defines the term "technical severance for legal reasons" to reflect the new PPS.</p> <p>The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and York Region Official Plan, 2010 also contain policies related to consents.</p> <p>A proposed consent must be consistent and conform to the applicable provincial and regional plans, as would a proposed modification to an Official Plan document.</p> <p>Refer to the body of the report for more details regarding this submission and subsequent King Township Council's resolution regarding this submission.</p> <p>Given and the apparent policy conformity challenges, no modification is proposed.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		 <p>With the New King OP under review by the Region we request that consideration be made and that the Town include site specific policy language that would permit a severance of the Lands.</p> <p>The PPS 2020, policy 1.1.5.2 c) permits residential development, including lot creation, which is locally appropriate. In this instance, the creation of a new lot is a paper exercise only, as the two homes function as independent properties already. We respectfully request that the Region recognize this in the New King OP, so that the Capobianco Family can seek a technical severance. Please find enclosed a letter from Groundswell Urban Planners Inc. to King Township, dated July 22, 2020, which speaks to the planning rationale for allowing a site specific policy that would permit a severance of the Lands. The letter also includes proposed language for such a policy to assist staff.</p>	
S. Kendall/ P. Davidson August 6, 2020			
21.	5840 18 th Sideroad	<p><i>Without prejudice</i></p> <p>To All Parties Concerned:</p> <p>I am taking this opportunity to communicate issues which have not been addressed or considered on my behalf by King Township as relates to the new proposed official plan. I am responding to this notice:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Our King Official Plan – Update</u></p> <p>Please be advised that the Township’s Growth Management Services Department is scheduled to report to the Council of the Township of King (Committee of the Whole) with respect to York Region’s proposed draft</p>	<p>Submission reviewed. Subject of an ongoing Township by-law matter. No modifications proposed by York Region.</p>

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>modifications to the adopted <i>Our King</i> Official Plan, at the following Special Council/Committee Meeting:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monday, August 10, 2020 at 6:00 P.M.</p> <p>I also address these facts to York Region as the approval authority for the official plan for King Township. I have copied the Clerk's office for King Township and York region as well as Sara Bockman acting as a planner for York Region who I hope will forward this email to the appropriate planner acting for York Region if she is not.</p> <p>A bit of background includes that our property was purchased in 2006. It was made clear in our communications we were to begin a fish hatchery at 5840 18th Side Road Schomberg. This address is an RU1 property. We inquired from the Town and current Mayor Margaret Black about the use of 16105 Highway 27. It was confirmed that this property was also RU1. Specifically, we were told that on highway 27 the Melo family who resides on this 50 acre property had a small retail store front and would not be a problem or concern for us. No expansion was to be authorized.</p> <p>We closed the purchase on our farm with Black's office. It is important for all to know that we did not purchase our property to live beside a neighbour who has so injured the use of our property. This use of the property next door was not identified in the agreement signed when we purchased our farm.</p> <p>King Township in the proposed new official plan cannot simply change things without informing the other property owners or letting us have a say. King Township is potentially in breach of contract by allowing some properties to expand while the other faces financial collapse. King Township continues to support the intentional intervention in our economic relations. For York Region to approve this King Township official plan- York Region can take upon itself- with King Township- this intentional intervention.</p> <p>In 2010, Allstone procured a contract to operate 24/7 April through October to have waste from highway 400 dumped onto its RU1 property.</p> <p>The Ontario Provincial Police shut down this operation when they attended the noise and vibration complaint of this illegal contract. Since this event we have filed 100s of noise, dust and vibration complaints to King Township regarding the operations and expansion of 16105 highway 27.</p> <p>The lack of cooperation from King Township to respond to any complaints against the Melo property resulted in filing a complaint with the Ombudsman office.</p> <p>King Township was instructed in the final Ombuds report to respond to the complaints, improve customer service, keep better records and was told to enforce the correct RU1 zoning on the Allstone location in Schomberg.</p> <p>Mayor Pelligrini stated to us that King Township decided they did not have to follow the Ombuds report recommendations.</p> <p>Since this event we have filed additional noise, dust and vibration complaints to King Township by law. King Township obtained one guilty plea from 16105 Highway 27. Two further court dates were established but King Township cancelled these proceedings as they claimed "inconsistencies" in the witnessed and photo</p>	

Submission No.	Subject Lands/ Section in Draft OP	Comments Received	Response by York Region Planning
		<p>documented complaints. We requested details but the response was King Township would not banter nor provide any details as to these inconsistencies. It was suggested by King Township we pursue our neighbour regarding these violations ourselves. King Township informed the York Regional Police that King by law would handle all complaints against the Allstone property. Now in 2020 King Township by law will not address the noise, dust, vibration complaints at all that have been filed against Allstone/JCM.</p> <p>When I contact York Regional Police at for instance 2am to file a noise complaint they will not attend this property (16105 highway 27) but refer me to King Township by law. King Township by law has in writing stated they will not address our complaints to this property.</p> <p>Our position is that Allstone should not be operating on 16105 highway 27. Regardless of endless inquiries to King Township by law we cannot even have confirmed the hours of operation for this business. Allstone continues to work and operate whenever they like. This includes Sundays, 3am, midnight.</p> <p>Repeatedly I have documented the interference of the Allstone/JCM property to the enjoyment, use and economic collapse of my farm property to King Township.</p> <p>Who will be taking responsibility for our financial losses. No corrective action has been taken.</p> <p>King Township has identified in the proposed new official plan, which York Region has been asked to approve, that existing aggregate operations be allowed to continue -this is regardless of zoning. No where is it stated in the proposed new official plan that existing aggregate operations are to comply with zoning. At the May 8 2019 open public meeting in Schomberg the Mayor Steve Pelligrini stated to us that the official plan and this public meeting did not cover the Schomberg rural properties which I had attended to speak to - but only residential. The consultants present stated there were perhaps 11 illegal properties that had to be addressed in Schomberg. I was not provided an opportunity to have our concerns addressed at this meeting. The consultants in attendance stated to us they were aware that Allstone was not grandfathered in nor operating under proper rules for zoning. We were told that they would reach out to us for input and I called and emailed to these consultants numerous times but no one ever responded to our pleas for assistance or requested our input. No one has responded to our calls nor approached us regarding these significant changes in the proposed official plan as residents regarding our damages, input, interference concerns – nothing. Instead we deal with slick half truths in the communications received by me from this municipality.</p> <p>MPAC and King Township have identified in writing the industrial interference by 16105 highway 27 to our enjoyment and use of our property as well as acknowledged the intentional intervention into our farm activities.</p> <p>Real estate services consider our property as uninhabitable due to this interference of 16105 highway 27.</p> <p>Rocks and paving stones are not RU1 farm activities but in relation to our farm fish activities it appears that rocks take precedence over food in King Township. I believe there are constitutional and human rights violations implicated in our treatment by King Township.</p>	

