



*land use planning
&
development*

23 Foxwood Road. Thornhill, ON L4J 9C4
Tel: 905.889.1564 | Fax: 905.889.6309
Website : Manettplanning.com

March 31, 2022

By e-mail only to regionalclerk@york.ca

Chair Wayne Emmerson and Members of Council
Region of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, On. L3Y 6Z1

Dear Regional Chair and Members of Regional Council

Re: York Region Municipal Comprehensive Review ("MCR")
York Region Draft Official Plan 2021- December 2021 (the "Plan")

I am the land use planning consultant for the Leslie Stouffville Landowners Association (LSLA), a group of property owners in the northeast area of the City of Richmond Hill. These landowners (14) control over 500 acres (200 hectares) of land around the Gormley GO Station. As you are aware, I have made a number of submissions on behalf of LSLA throughout this MCR process, which it appears have not been considered as worthy of consideration, or for inclusion into the proposed Regional Official Plan, as proposed. Our position related to the long-range planning for the Leslie/Stouffville area, and particularly the Gormley GO Station MTSA area remains unchanged from our earlier submissions, which we feel have not been adequately considered by Regional staff. Therefore, I am attaching our previous documentation again, with a request that they be considered as formal input to the proposed Regional Official Plan prior to it being submitted to Regional Council for adoption.

As we have stated in these previous written submissions, as well as through our deputations at Regional Council meetings on the subject, this area of land within the City of Richmond Hill, is no longer suitable for ongoing farming/agricultural use as a result of the growth through development creating the urban areas around them and the encroachment of conflicting urban uses. We have been asking for the area to be studied, specifically with respect to this significant land use issue, as part of the MCR being carried out by both the Region of York, and the City of Richmond Hill. This exercise has not been carried out at either level since the respective planners at the Region and City indicated that the province has advised that changes to the Countryside designation could not be carried out since these were Greenbelt lands and only the Minister of Municipal Affairs could make such changes to designations with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation

Plan Area. We have never been provided with any correspondence sent to Region, or the City, from the province that would support this advice having been provided.

However, this fact certainly did not preclude either the Region, and/or City staff, from carrying out the “study” of this area specifically, as requested through an approved Motion from Richmond Hill Council, to assess the ongoing viability of farming and the maintaining of the so-called rural community, as part of the respective MCR processes. If the findings of such study(s) determined that the ongoing Countryside designation was no longer appropriate, for the reasons that we have provided extensive input on through our submissions, then it would be appropriate for the Region (and the City) to identify the area for future consideration within their updated Official Plans as Settlement Area and subject to further planning through identified Secondary Plan/MTSA centred planning study(s). This approach is clearly within the mandate of Regional staff and Regional Council, similar to the manner in which they addressed submissions by the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, on the east side of Hwy. 404.

In fact, the best way to preserve the Oak Ridges Moraine Linkage and Core Areas that exist in the Leslie Street/Stouffville Road and Gormley GO Station area, would be through the preparation of a Gormley GO Station centred Secondary Plan. Such a Plan would clearly establish the areas to be protected with appropriate Secondary Plan level land use designations, with related setbacks, all based on more detailed analysis including the relevant environmental and natural heritage studies that are supposed to form the basis for Secondary Plan policies for complete communities.

It is important to note that the planning for this area, under the York Region Official Plan, is intended to cover a timeframe to 2051 and the City of Richmond Hill Official Plan to 2041. Now is the time to initiate the study of these lands as the former rural community has all but disappeared and farming is no longer viable, as you have heard directly from the area’s most significant farmer and land holder, Paul Doner, whose family has farmed this area since 1802.

Little importance was given to Mr. Doner’s submissions and, the Region’s review of the agricultural in its consideration of that component of the MCR, completely ignored the issue of the viability of farming and agricultural land use, and the appropriateness of the continuation of a “rural community” in this part of the Region.

MTSA 48 GORMLEY GO STATION

Very specifically, LSLA is concerned that the boundary of the Gormley GO Station MTSA 48 is completely inappropriate and should be expanded to encompass additional lands, in order that a properly planned transit supportive community can be designed and developed around this transit hub. In fact, the current boundary does not even encompass the station area itself, and no lands in the northeast quadrant of Leslie Street and Stouffville Road to Hwy.404, have been included within the MTSA boundary.

Given the land ownership in this part of Richmond Hill, as characterized by the members of LSLA, there is an opportunity in this area to provide for demonstration projects through a newly designed complete community, around a transit hub, that has been completely ignored by Regional staff.

OUR REQUESTS

We urge both Regional staff and Regional Council, to reconsider the approach taken for this area, (encompassing the lands north of 19th Avenue on either side of Leslie Street, south of Bethesda Road, bounded by the North Leslie Secondary Plan and the West Gormley Secondary Plan east to Hwy.404) in the proposed York Region Official Plan and **to expand the boundaries of the Gormley GO Station MTSA 48 and further to include the additional lands around the station area to provide for the creation of the Transit Oriented Community**, as we have indicated in our earlier submissions.

In addition, **we request that the same notation on the applicable maps attached to, and forming part of, the proposed York Region Official Plan that were used for the nearby Whitchurch-Stouffville lands, be provided as the land use designation on Maps 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 4, 6, 9B and 10 of the proposed Plan.** This notation would read as follows:

AREA WITHIN ORMCP CONDITIONAL UPON AMENDMENTS TO ONTARIO
REGULATION 140/02*

This designation on each of the Maps would be accompanied by the following note:

*URBAN DESIGNATIONS ARE CONDITIONAL UPON AMENDMENTS TO THE
ORM DESIGNATIONS PRIOR TO THE ADOPTION OF THE ROP.

In conclusion, it is important that the LSLA area of the City of Richmond Hill, as identified in the previous submissions (attached to this submission) be incorporated into the proposed Regional Official Plan in order to be properly planned within the immediate context of the 2051 time horizon and that the requested studies be carried out now, as part of this MCR process. This will ensure that the appropriate Secondary Plan exercise be established to take place following the anticipated approval of this version of the York Region Official Plan, with appropriate amendments, going forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to this important planning process.

Yours truly



Michael S. Manett, MCIP, RPP.

Per: MPlan Inc.

Attachments

cc. Paul Freeman, Chief Planner, Region of York
Kelvin Kwan, Commissioner of Planning and Infrastructure, Richmond Hill
Hon. Victor Fedeli, Chair of Cabinet
Hon. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Hon. Caroline Mulroney, Minister of Transportation
Mayor David West, City of Richmond Hill
Paul Doner
LSLA



*land use planning
&
development*

23 Foxwood Road. Thornhill, ON L4J 9C4

Tel: 905.889.1564 | Fax: 905.889.6309

Website: mplaninc.com

October 20, 2021

Chair Wayne Emmerson and Members of Council

Region of York

17250 Yonge Street

Newmarket, Ontario

Dear Chair Emmerson and Members of Council:

RE: Item F.1 York Region Special Council Meeting October 21, 2021

Alternate 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment Scenarios in Response to Consultation

MPLAN REVIEW OF THE YORK REGION PROPOSED 2051 FORECAST AND LAND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

MPLAN Inc. has undertaken a review of York Region's Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment on behalf of Leslie Stouffville Landowners Association (LSLA), a group of landowners controlling lands encompassing greater than 500 acres (200 hectares) in the northeast corner of Richmond Hill. Much of this land is farmland of declining agricultural value where normal farming practices are no longer viable. Many landowners would like the opportunity to sell their land and purchase viable farmland elsewhere. This is only possible if they are able to obtain a fair price, and since the land is no longer suitable for its permitted use, a change land use designation is required.

The LSLA lands are adjacent to rapidly urbanizing parts of Richmond Hill in the West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plan areas as well as nearby parts of the region. This has substantially increased traffic and created other land use conflicts and has in turn led expanding and urbanizing infrastructure in the area. Completed or proposed infrastructure upgrades include the Gormley GO (MTSA) Station, Highway 404 expansion, the Leslie Street realignment, the York Region Water System, the York-Durham Sanitary System, the Duffin Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, and the Leslie Street Trunk Sewer to 19th Avenue. Infrastructure and land use change has hastened the urbanization of the area, the fragmentation of farmland, and made farming extremely difficult.

For this reason, LSLA requested that the land be considered for inclusion in the urban expansion through the Municipal Comprehensive Review on March 17, 2021 (Attachment 1a), which would require the York to evaluate the lands' agricultural value. However, the land was excluded from consideration as York Region incorrectly understood the land to be designated *Protected Countryside* in the Greenbelt Plan and analysis of the lands' agricultural value was not conducted. This review has been undertaken to address the lack of analysis of the lands' agricultural value, to clarify policy differences, and assess what lands were unnecessarily excluded from the urban expansion.

PROVINCIAL LAND USE POLICY

The changing nature of the area, through ongoing urbanization and the increasing difficulty of farming, conflict with the land use policy that governs the area. The LSLA lands are governed by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) area and are also part of the Greenbelt. Policies in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are complex and at times contradictory. Both plans have land use designations that are intended to protect rural and agricultural land – *Protected Countryside* under the Greenbelt Plan and *Countryside* under the ORMCP. Section 2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan states that where the ORMCP applies, the *Protected Countryside* designation in the Greenbelt Plan does not. This is supported by York Region Official Plan, policy 6.1.1, which states that the policies of the ORMCP prevail over that of the Greenbelt Plan.

The ORMCP provides a much more thorough, detailed policy framework with distinct land use categories while the Greenbelt Plan policies are broad and subsumed under the *Protected Countryside* designation. The intent of the ORMCP *Countryside* designation is also more restrictive than the *Protected Countryside* designation. Both *Protected Countryside* and *Countryside* are intended to preserve rural and agricultural lands, but the ORMCP states that the *Countryside* designation is also intended to function as a “transition and buffer” between rural, agricultural, natural heritage, and urban land uses. Considering the intent of the designations and content of the plans, the *Countryside* designation in the ORMCP is the more restrictive, and therefore applicable land use designation on the LSLA lands.

In the context of the applicable ORMCP, the *Countryside* designation is no longer appropriate for this part of the City of Richmond Hill, given its intent and purpose. Land fragmentation has broken down the intended transition and buffer area and the land no longer serves the stated purpose of the designation. The ORMCP provides a clear definition of purpose for the *Countryside* designation, which is provided below.

13. (1) The purpose of Countryside Areas is to encourage agricultural and other rural uses that support the Plan's objectives by,

- a. protecting prime agricultural areas;*
- b. promoting and protecting agricultural and other rural land uses and normal farm practices;*
- c. maintaining the rural character of the Rural Settlement*

This land area no longer meets these criteria. Normal farming practices are no longer viable due to the decline of the rural character as the area becomes increasingly urban. To those farmers that have farmed the land for many years, including Paul Doner, the primary farmer of the lands

in the area, these lands cannot be considered 'prime' agricultural land as the crop yields from it are consistently below the provincial average. This is detailed in the attached April 16, 2021 Letter and Attachments sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as input to the Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt (Attachment 1b) and also supported by a study by Ryerson University Planning Students prepared for MPlan Inc. which reviewed the viability of ongoing and future agriculture use in the Gormley Area (Gormley Go Community Study, April 2021) (Attachment 1c).

These provincial land use policies are what York Region understood as their primary limitation in conducting their analysis. The policies were seen as inflexible, so lands considered to be part of the Greenbelt Plan or the ORMCP were precluded from urban expansion. While the Province has stated they are not willing to remove lands from the Greenbelt, they have also indicated that they are willing to amend some provincial land use policy if municipalities conduct the necessary analysis to justify policy change through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process and bring the request for policy change to the Province. The Region has incorrectly identified the LSLA lands as *Protected Countryside* under the Greenbelt Plan, rather than *Countryside* under the ORMCP, and as a result has failed to properly utilize the Municipal Comprehensive Review process to evaluate the lands' agricultural value and whether they are able to serve the purpose of the *Countryside* designation.

It is important to note that York Region has conducted this analysis before and stated continuously over the years, that these lands do not constitute prime agricultural land and is not of sufficient agricultural value to warrant preservation. Direction from the Region to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in a letter dated August 22, 1994 (Attachment 1b), stated that not all agricultural lands in the Region should have the same designation and an accompanying map illustrated that no agricultural policy areas of provincial interest were to be established in Richmond Hill. Later, on July 24, 2002, a letter (also attached) indicated that there was "No provincially significant agricultural areas identified within the Town of Richmond Hill...". Again, on September 5, 2007, regional staff made similar findings. A staff report to Richmond Hill Council on Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity OPA 218 reported on the approval of Regional Official Plan 50 that redesignated the Agricultural Policy to Rural Policy Area. The change in designation was approved on the basis that: no provincially significant agricultural area existing within the Town, the fragmented ownership of lots having less than 100 acres in size and the existence of non-agricultural uses such as golf courses, aggregate operations, a composting facility and pockets of rural residential uses (Attachment 1b).

The land is designated *Countryside* in the ORMCP but is no longer able to serve the purpose of the designation, which York Region has confirmed on multiple occasions. Yet the Region has not correctly identified the applicable policies or conduct the necessary study.

YORK REGION PROPOSED FORECAST AND LAND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

York Region released the Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment in March 2021 and the Alternate 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment in September 2021. The Forecast and Land Needs Assessment are required components of the Municipal Comprehensive Review process as they determine how much additional land will be required to accommodate the population and employment forecasts for the Region prescribed by the Province through the Growth Plan.

The Provincial Growth Plan provides municipalities with minimum population and employment target based on their forecasts and municipalities then must determine how much land will be required and what land will be included in the expansion of the *Urban Area*. Determining how much land is require is done using the methodology found in the Growth Plan, but municipalities have more latitude in determining what land will be included in the Urban Area.

The regional report evaluates the policy context, growth management considerations, population and employment projections, and urban expansion consideration. Urban expansion considerations include evaluating request for municipalities and landowners for their land to be included in the urban expansion. The document titled 'Landowner and Municipal Submissions for Urban Expansion for the Municipal Comprehensive Review' (Attachment 2) identifies every request for inclusion in the urban area expansion made to the Region and which will or will not be included in the expansion.

YORK REGION URBAN EXPANSION EVALUATION

The Region evaluated 74 requests by landowners or their agents to have their lands included in the urban expansion (Attachment 2), although the Land Needs Assessment report states there was 71 requested with 40 being recommended for inclusion by the Region. Chapter 6 of the report outlines the Region's consideration in assessing these requests.

The chapter explains what the Region sees as their limitations and the criteria by which the requests were assessed. As stated previously, the primary limitation is identified as provincial land use policy, which the Region understands to be inflexible, so lands considered to be part of the Greenbelt Plan or the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) are precluded from urban expansion. This ignores that while the Province has indicated that they not willing to allow development on Greenbelt lands, but have also indicated that they are willing to amend some provincial land use policy if municipalities conduct the necessary analysis to justify policy change through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process and bring the request for policy change to the Province. ORMCP lands are unnecessarily precluded from consideration for urban expansion and as a result only Whitebelt lands considered for expansion. Whitebelt lands are defined in the Land Needs Assessment Report as "lands located outside the Region's existing *Urban Area* and outside of the Greenbelt Plan are available for urban expansion".

For the Whitebelt lands, the Region considers the following criteria in determining whether or include in the urban expansion (p. 34).

- Timing and availability of water/wastewater and transportation infrastructure.
- Financial impacts to the Region.
- Contiguity with existing urban areas.
- Logical planning boundaries.
- Building complete communities that provide for both living and working opportunities.
- Protecting valuable agricultural areas.
- Supporting the Regional structure.

Based on the criteria and limitations outlined above, the Region made one of four possible recommendations for each request.

- 1) *Inclusion*: "The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment."

- 2) *Partial Inclusion*: “The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province’s mandated land needs assessment.”
- 3) *Exclusion 1*: “In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).”
- 4) *Exclusion 2*: “A number of considerations informed the identification preliminary urban boundary expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion.”

Lands that were recommended for *Inclusion* or *Partial Inclusion* were also identified as being recommended for Community or Employment uses.

MPLAN URBAN EXPANSION EVALUATION

MPLAN has undertaken its own evaluation of the urban expansion request. This evaluation is based on 6 criteria to determine if requests that were excluded that provide opportunities for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland. The criteria are as follows.

- 1) Is the land proximate to Provincial or Regional transportation infrastructure?
- 2) Is the location of the land conducive to efficient servicing?
- 3) Is the land contiguous with existing urban uses?
- 4) Does the land fall within logical planning boundaries?
- 5) What are the lands’ agricultural value?
- 6) What is land use designation in the York Region Official Plan?

These criteria broadly overlap with some of York Region’s considerations as they are essential for good planning, but there are two important considerations in our evaluation that are different. First, our evaluation does not preclude land from consideration based provincial policy that the province is open to amending should the Region justify and communicate interest in policy change. Second, we evaluate the agricultural value of land based on the current state of the land, using the description provided by Ministry of Agriculture of what the characteristics of prime agricultural land should be, and do not presume previous evaluations of agricultural value to be correct. The following is a description of the criteria and how they are operationalized.

Is the land proximate to Provincial or Regional transportation infrastructure?

This criterion is evaluated by determining what transportation infrastructure is near the land examined in each request as development proximate to higher-order transportation infrastructure allows for more efficient use of infrastructure and land use optimization. For each request it will be stated which pieces of transportation infrastructure are near the land, if any. *Provincial* will be assigned to requests near 400-series highways or GO Stations and these lands will be considered most suitable for development based on this criterion. *Regional* will be assigned to requests near regional roads and will be considered suitable for development, and *None* will be assigned to requests not near significant transportation infrastructure and will be considered least suitable for development.

Is the location of the land conducive to efficient servicing?

The criterion is evaluated by determining whether a request is proximate to current and planned servicing based on the 2041 Recommended Water and Wastewater Servicing Maps from the Regional Municipality of York Water and Wastewater Master Plan published in November 2016.

Is the land contiguous with existing urban uses?

This criterion is evaluated by determining whether the requests is contiguous with existing urban areas as this allows for efficient use of land and infrastructure. This is based on whether or not a request is directly adjacent to residential, retail, or employment uses that are part of a larger community. Requests adjacent or small, rural residential or employment uses were not considered to be contiguous with existing urban areas.

Does the land fall within logical planning boundaries?

This criterion is evaluated by determining a request's location in relation to the designated *Urban Area* or *Towns and Villages* of a municipality. Requests that fall within the planning boundaries of a municipality but are not located adjacent to the *Urban Area* or *Towns or Villages* are not considered to fall within logical planning boundaries.

What is the agricultural value of the land?

This criterion is evaluated by assessing the potential agricultural value of each request based on the characteristics of "prime agricultural areas" as stated by the Ministry of Agriculture. According to the Ministry website, "prime agricultural areas represent large, generally contiguous blocks of land that enable current and future opportunities for agriculture." Requests that are large contiguous blocks of land and are not adjacent to or being encroached upon by urban uses were determined to be of high agricultural value and designated as *High*. Requests that are large contiguous blocks of lands that are adjacent to or being encroached upon by urban uses were determined to be of *Medium* agricultural value. Requests that include fragmented land and are surrounded or are being encroached upon by urban uses were determined to be of *Low* agricultural value. Requests are included land that is already development are indicated with *None*.

What is the land use designation in the York Region Official Plan?

The last criterion is the request's land use designation in the York Region Official Plan. The York Region Official plan includes land use designations that mirror provincial designations in the Greenbelt Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, so the regional Official Plan is useful for determining both regional and provincial land use designations. Requests that are not suitable for inclusion are indicated in red and this includes land designated *Protected Countryside* (identified as 'Greenbelt') in the Greenbelt Plan and lands designated *Natural Linkage* in the ORMCP. Requests that are indicted in yellow are those that include both Whitebelt lands and *Protected Countryside* (identified as Whitebelt/Greenbelt). Requests that are suitable for inclusion are indicated in green, with Whitebelt lands being light green and lands designated *Countryside* in the ORMCP being dark green.

As stated previously, the province is willing to change provincial land use policy if regional and municipal staff conduct the necessary analysis through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process to justify and communicate their interest in policy change. Our analysis considers this

possibility, so for this criterion ORMCP *Countryside* is identified suitable for development and ORMCP *Natural Linkage* as not suitable for development. This is because of the intent of the designations. The purpose of the *Natural Linkage* designation is to improve, restore, and protect ecological features, while the purpose of the *Countryside* designation is to protect agricultural uses and normal farm practices. Demonstrating that the ecological function of land is beyond restoration is difficult and beyond the scope of this report, while the characteristics of 'prime agricultural areas' are clear.

FINDINGS

FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

Similar to York Region's consideration of requests of inclusion, MPLAN's evaluation is visualized in a chart (Attachment 3). The chart indicates location of the request, our evaluation of the land based on the above criteria, York Region's recommendation for the request, and our assessment of whether the request should have been considered for inclusion.

The chart uses a colour coded and numbered ranking system. If a request meets a criterion for inclusion, it will be indicated in green, and if it does not, it will be indicated in red. Requests will also be assigned a numbered ranking based on the number of criteria met from the first 5 criteria. If a request meets a criterion for inclusion, it will also be assigned a score of 1; if it does not, it will be assigned a score of 0. For criteria 1 and 5, land of *Medium* agricultural value and land near only regional transportation will be indicated in yellow and received a score of 0.5

For the York Regional Official Plan land use designation, the 6th criteria, it will be stated whether developing the land is possible based on the land use designation, which will be done by identifying the land as *open*, *closed*, or *partially open* to development. Land designated Whitebelt or *Countryside* (ORMCP) will be *open*, land designated Greenbelt or *Natural Linkage* (ORMCP) will be *closed*, and land designated both Whitebelt and Greenbelt will be *partially open*, as they are only open to partial inclusion.

FINDINGS

- 1) There are 11 requests ranked 5 that are *open* to development. York Region recommended inclusion for 6 and exclusion for 5. According to our analysis, 5 requests for inclusion that have very high potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland have been excluded unnecessarily.
- 2) There are 14 requests ranked 4.5 that are *open* or *partially open* to development. York Region recommended inclusion for 4, exclusion for 4, and partial inclusion for 6. According to our analysis, 4 requests for inclusion that have high potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland have been excluded unnecessarily.
- 3) There are 8 requests ranked 4 that are *open* or *partially open* to development. York Region recommended inclusion for 4, exclusion for 4, and partial inclusion for 1. According to our analysis, 3 requests for inclusion that have relatively high potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland have been excluded unnecessarily.
- 4) There is 1 request ranked 3.5 that is *open* to development and York Region recommended that request for inclusion.

- 5) There is 1 request ranked 3 that is *open* to development and York Region recommended this request for exclusion. According to our analysis, this request has potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland and has been excluded unnecessarily.
- 6) There are 4 requests ranked 2.5 that are *open* or *partially open* to development. York Region recommended inclusion for 1, exclusion for 2, and partial inclusion for 2. One of the requests that is potentially *open* to development was recommended for partial inclusion and has not been counted as an unnecessary exclusion. According to our analysis, 1 request has some potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland and has been excluded unnecessarily.
- 7) There are a total of 26 requests ranked from 2 to 0. Some of these requests were stated by York Region to be ineligible for consideration due to being designated *Countryside* in the ORMCP. As stated previously, it is incorrect to exclude lands for this reason, but these requests do not meet other criteria for inclusion and have low potential for efficient development while not reducing the amount of valuable farmland according to our analysis.

FINDINGS							
Ranking	MPLAN Analysis			York Region Recommendation			Unnecessary Exclusions
	Open	Closed	Partial	Inclusion	Exclusion	Partial	
5	11	0	0	6	4	0	5
4.5	8	0	6	4	4	6	4
4	6	1	2	4	4	1	3
3.5	1	4	0	1	4	0	0
3	3	1	0	2	2	0	1
2.5	3	1	1	1	2	2	1
2	5	0	2	5	0	2	0
1.5	0	3	1	0	3	1	0
1	5	3	4	2	5	4	0
0.5	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

CONCLUSION

MPlan Inc. and LSLA support the region's goals for the Municipal Comprehensive Review, as stated in the Proposed 2015 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment Report. It is important that York Region use its land, infrastructure, and financial resources efficiently, and this requires both building complete communities and preserving valuable farmland. To accomplish this, the region must undertake a thorough analysis of land use and land use policy. Unfortunately, reports released by the region to date have not conducted this analysis. Provincial land use policy has mistakenly been understood to be unchangeable and previous assessments of the agricultural value of land in the region have not been revisited. This has led to the region

excluding lands that are no longer viable as farmland in locations conducive to building complete communities and using infrastructure efficiently.

This report provides some of that analysis. For the LSLA lands, and others in the region, the ORMCP *Countryside* designation is the applicable designation, not the *Protected Countryside* designation in the Greenbelt Plan, which is confirmed by the York Region Official Plan. While the province is not willing to consider removing land from the Greenbelt, they are willing to consider other changes to provincial land use policy. York Region confirmed on multiple occasions that the LSLA lands do not constitute valuable farmland and new analysis should be conducted to confirm this as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review process to determine if the land serves of the purpose of the ORMCP *Countryside* designation. If it does not, the region should request a change in policy. This is essential to achieving the stated goals of York Region, which is use land, infrastructure, and financial resources efficiently.

We would also appreciate the opportunity to discuss this complex matter further. Thank you for considering our submission.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michael S. Manett". The signature is written in a cursive style and includes a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael S. Manett, MCIP, RPP.

cc. LSLA
Paul Doner
Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville
City of Richmond Hill



*land use planning
&
development*

23 Foxwood Road. Thornhill, ON L4J 9C4
Tel: 905.889.1564 | Fax: 905.889.6309
Website : Manettplanning.com

ATTACHMENT 1A

March 17, 2021

Chair Wayne Emmerson and Members of Council

Region of York

17250 Yonge Street

Newmarket, Ontario

Dear Chair Emmerson and Members of Council:

Re: Item F.2 York Region Special Council Meeting – March 18, 2021

REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN UPDATE – POLICY DIRECTIONS REPORT

AND SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE POSITION OF LSLA REGARDING ITS REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF PROTECTED COUNTRYSIDE FOR REDESIGNATION TO SETTLEMENT AREA IN THE GORMLEY GO STATION AND HWY.404 CORRIDOR

Further to my earlier correspondence and deputations in January 2021 related to the January 14, 2021 Committee of the Whole Meeting and the Council Meeting of January 28, 2021, I am again requesting that Regional Council direct staff to:

- 1) carry out a review of parts of the COUNTRYSIDE AREA designated lands for consideration of redesignation to SETTLEMENT AREA from the City of Richmond Hill and the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville and;
- 2) for Regional Staff to engage with landowner/stakeholders including farmers and members of the community in the affected area for input to the MCR process.

Once again, I am disappointed to see that the Regional Official Plan Update - Policy Directions Report before you today for consideration does not address this matter. The Agricultural and Agri Food Sector Strategy Report from 2017 is now out of date with respect to this geographical area of the Region and at the time it was prepared it combined the areas of Aurora and Richmond Hill, which together only represented 3% of the Region's cropland. Now, at least 5 years later from the time that information was

obtained, I expect the cropland area has been even further reduced and the Richmond Hill component is less as a result of the further urbanization in the area.

The broad findings and recommendations from the 2017 study are not relevant to the more specific issues affecting this area of Richmond Hill. All the policies and the direction proposed is intended to protect and maintain a viable agricultural economy. There is no direction or recommendations to address areas where agriculture is no longer viable or no longer exists. There are no policies or direction to evaluate this possibility or potential over the long term yet the MCR policies are to provide direction and land use policy to 2051.

This area contains two GO Stations (Bloomington and Gormley) and mainly non-farming uses, and the remaining agricultural related activities have become less economically feasible to maintain for reasons we have detailed previously. The direction that Regional staff continues to promote in the Policy Directions Report for, the Agriculture theme area, is a “one size fits all” package of policies that continues to ignore the differences between areas that are no longer viable as ongoing farming, and legitimate agricultural lands and rural farming community areas that have not been directly affected by encroaching and surrounding urban development.

Figure 52 in the study, re Age of Farm Operators, has not been given significant importance. The average age of farm operators is increasing each year. The number of retirement age farm operators over 55 years of age in 2016 was already well over 90% while those under 35 years of age was only 6%. At this rate there will be no farm operators left to farm the land and no exit strategy for those who are retiring.

As I noted in my earlier presentations to you, I believe that the COUNTRYSIDE land use designation is no longer appropriate for this area of Richmond Hill and Whitchurch-Stouffville. This specifically results from the demise of farming and the agricultural community coupled with the expansion of transit and the urban development surrounding this area which has impacted on the ability to maintain a rural character and the continued viable farming community.

At this time, we are asking that the matter be studied as part of the long-term planning process (2051) for this geographical part of the Regional Official Plan. This is an appropriate request as part of a Municipal Comprehensive Review and is currently being undertaken as part of the City of Richmond Hill City Plan 2041 (Municipal Comprehensive Review).

The continuation of the existing rural policies for these lands is no longer appropriate for an area that has been impacted by urbanization and is becoming surrounded by urban development. Now is the time, through the Regional Plan Comprehensive Municipal

Review process, to study this issue and reassess the area to look ahead with policies for the future since the new Regional Official Plan is supposed to plan for 2051.

PLEASE ADD A RECOMMENDATION UNDER ITEM F.2 TO DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PROTECTED COUNTRYSIDE AREA FOR POTENTIAL REDESIGNATION TO SETTLEMENT AREA IN THE GORMLEY GO STATION AND HWY.404 CORRIDOR

The study of this issue, as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review, in no way undermines current Provincial policy and in fact is the specific direction that we have been given by the Province through our discussions with provincial representatives, as the appropriate manner in which to deal with the issue.

Please make sure that Regional Staff engage with landowner/stakeholders including farmers and members of the community from the affected area for input to the regional planning process. Thank you.

Yours truly,



Michael S. Manett, MCIP, RPP.

cc. LSLA
Paul Doner
Whitchurch-Stouffville



ATTACHMENT 1B

April 16, 2021

Steve Clark

Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Re: **Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt**

Dear Minister Clark,

INTRODUCTION

I am the principal of MPlan Inc., a land use consulting firm, acting on behalf of the Leslie Stouffville Landowners Association (LSLA). The LSLA is an organized group of landowners that collectively owns approximately 500 acres of land in the City of Richmond Hill, immediately west of Highway 404, north and south of Stouffville Road. The LSLA lands are illustrated on the accompanying map (Attachment 1).

The LSLA lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) area and most of it has been farmed by the Doner Family for over 200 years. However, these lands and the broader Gormley area, are changing rapidly and the viability of the agricultural industry has declined significantly in the past 20 years. Encroaching urbanization, land fragmentation, increased traffic, new infrastructure, and the departure of agricultural support businesses in the area have all made ongoing farming extraordinarily difficult.

Therefore, we are taking this opportunity to respond to the request for Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt. This submission is further to my brief oral submission to the Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt virtual meeting of Friday April 16, 2021, hosted by MPP Michael Parsa and your Parliamentary Assistant, MPP Jim McDonell.

In reviewing the listed Discussion questions outlined in the Consultation Proposal Summary we will specifically be addressing the following questions:

- 4) Do you have suggestions for other potential areas to grow the Greenbelt?
- 5) How should we balance or prioritize any potential Greenbelt expansion with the other provincial priorities mentioned above? and
- 6) Are there other priorities that should be considered?

To this end, our submission will focus on the provincial priorities outlined by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, namely agriculture, infrastructure, growth management,

and natural heritage and water resource systems. More specifically, we will address the decline of agriculture in northeast Richmond Hill due to rapid growth, urbanization, and changing infrastructure, and the opportunity to undertake a comprehensive land use planning study that could connect and protect natural heritage assets in Richmond Hill, Whitchurch-Stouffville, and Aurora, potentially incorporating a new provincial park, and providing a connected open-space system for future residents resulting in a “Growing of the Greenbelt”.

This submission aims to support the Growing of the Greenbelt by protecting natural heritage features based on science, while making efficient use of existing transit infrastructure and lands that are unable sustain ongoing farming in an economical manner. It should be clear, nothing in this submission will suggest that lands should be opened for development which are deemed to have significant natural heritage characteristics. Rather, this submission suggests that we should protect what needs to be protected, while still make efficient use of existing resources, through a comprehensive land use planning exercise based on an evaluation of the changing realities of trying to maintain agriculture operations in an urbanizing environment.

POLICY REGIME

The changing nature of the area, through ongoing urbanization and the increasing difficulty of farming, conflict with the land use policy that governs the area. As noted above, the LSLA lands, located within the City of Richmond Hill, are governed by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) area, and are also part of the Greenbelt. Policies in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are complex and at times contradictory. Both plans have land use designations that are intended to protect rural and agricultural land – *Protected Countryside* under the Greenbelt Plan and *Countryside* under the ORMCP. Section 2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan states that where the ORMCP applies, the *Protected Countryside* designation in the Greenbelt Plan does not. This is supported by York Region Official Plan, policy 6.1.1, which states that the policies of the ORMCP prevail over that of the Greenbelt Plan.

The ORMCP provides a much more thorough, detailed policy framework with distinct land use categories while the Greenbelt Plan policies are broad and subsumed under the *Protected Countryside* designation. The intent of the ORMCP *Countryside* designation is also more restrictive than the *Protected Countryside* designation. Both *Protected Countryside* and *Countryside* are intended to preserve rural and agricultural lands, but the ORMCP states that the *Countryside* designation is also intended to function as a “transition and buffer” between rural, agricultural, natural heritage, and urban land uses. Considering the intent of the designations and content of the plans, the *Countryside* designation in the ORMCP is the more restrictive, and therefore applicable land use designation on the LSLA lands.

In my opinion, in the context of the applicable ORMCP, the *Countryside* designation is no longer appropriate for this part of the City of Richmond Hill, given its intent and purpose.

Land fragmentation has broken down the intended transition and buffer area and the land no longer serves the stated purpose of the designation. The ORMCP provides a clear definition of purpose for the *Countryside* designation, which is provided below.

13. (1) *The purpose of Countryside Areas is to encourage agricultural and other rural uses that support the Plan's objectives by,*
- a. *protecting prime agricultural areas;*
 - b. *promoting and protecting agricultural and other rural land uses and normal farm practices;*
 - c. *maintaining the rural character of the Rural Settlement*

This land area no longer meets these criteria. Normal farming practices are no longer viable due to the decline of the rural character as the area becomes increasingly urban. To those farmers that have farmed the land for many years, including Paul Doner, the primary farmer of the lands in the area, these lands cannot be considered 'prime' agricultural land as the crop yields from it are consistently below the provincial average.

York Region has stated continuously over the years, that these lands do not constitute prime agricultural land and is not of sufficient agricultural value to warrant preservation. Direction from the Region to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in a letter dated August 22, 1994 (Attachment 2), stated that not all agricultural lands in the Region should have the same designation and an accompanying map illustrated that no agricultural policy areas of provincial interest were to be established in Richmond Hill. Later, on July 24, 2002, a letter (Attachment 3) indicated that there was "No provincially significant agricultural areas identified within the Town of Richmond Hill...". Again, on September 5, 2007, regional staff made similar findings. A Staff Report to Richmond Hill Council on Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity OPA 218, SRPD.07.086 (Attachment 4), reported on the approval of Regional Official Plan 50 that redesignated the Agricultural Policy to Rural Policy Area. The change in designation was approved on the basis that: no provincially significant agricultural area existing within the Town, the fragmented ownership of lots having less than 100 acres in size and the existence of non-agricultural uses such as golf courses, aggregate operations, a composting facility and pockets of rural residential uses.

THE GORMLEY GO STATION AREA

Rapid development in the West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plan areas of Richmond Hill and nearby parts of the region, has substantially increased traffic and created other land use conflicts in the area. This has in turn lead to the widening and urbanization of roads such as Leslie Street, for which a realignment has been proposed. Traffic and roads are now oriented to urban commuters and this has made the essential task of moving farm equipment from one field to another difficult and dangerous. The new Gormley GO Station and related Transit Depot occupy substantial portions of land along with other non-agricultural uses. Residential development, road infrastructure upgrades, and new GO transit infrastructure have all contributed to the fragmentation of the LSLA lands, making ongoing farming extremely difficult.

New roads and transit stations are only part of a broader shift from rural to urban infrastructure. Infrastructure supporting the agricultural industry has almost completely left the area. All the mills that used to serve the area have closed, all three tractor dealerships have closed or stopped selling equipment needed for farming, and there is only one remaining seed dealer in York Region which primarily serves Durham. Meanwhile, the Province, the Region, and Lower Tier municipalities have made substantial investments in the Highway 404 expansion, the York Region Water System, the York-Durham Sanitary System, the Duffin Creek Water Pollution Control Plant, the Leslie Street Trunk Sewer to 19th Avenue, and have designated the Gormley GO Station a Major Transit Station Area. York Region is growing rapidly, and government and business have responded to that growth in a way that is hastening the transition of Gormley into an urban area.

Determining an appropriate course of action for this area of the City of Richmond Hill and the LSLA lands requires a comprehensive land use study to assess the viability of the agriculture in the area and the potential for new, and more appropriate long-term land uses. This can be achieved without removing the land from the ORMCP as this provincial level plan provides for urban development through its *Settlement Area* designation, described as follows:

18. (1) *The purpose of Settlement Areas is to focus and contain urban growth by,*
- (O).a) encouraging the development of communities that provide their residents with convenient access to an appropriate mix of employment, transportation options and local services and a full range of housing and public service facilities;*
 - (b) promoting the efficient use of land with transit-supportive densities, through Intensification and redevelopment within existing urban areas.*

There is an opportunity to create a comprehensive land use plan for this area that provides for a mixed-use, transit-oriented community that protects and enhances our most valuable natural assets by linking the Oak Ridges Moraine Corridor Park through the area to connect with Phyllis Rawlinson Park, TRCA land, ORM Core and Linkage area, all through the establishment of a Secondary Plan for the area between the West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plans and incorporating a potential Oak Ridges Provincial Park. This could be further linked, through intermunicipal cooperation, to Whitchurch-Stouffville and Aurora, providing a linked open-space system for use by future residents of the area and the region resulting in a “Growing of the Greenbelt”.

ACTION BY THE CITY OF RICHMOND HILL

The City of Richmond Hill is in the process of undertaking a Municipal Comprehensive Review. In their preliminary work on this significant planning exercise, the City in its City Plan 2041 Official Plan Update, dated January 19, 2021, has identified the northeast part

of the City, including the Gormley GO Station and LSLA lands, as an area to be considered for Settlement Expansion (Attachment 5).

The Municipal Comprehensive Review process will provide information essential in determining the future of the Gormley area and addressing provincial priorities related to agriculture, infrastructure, growth management, and natural heritage and water resources. This also provides an opportunity to grow the Greenbelt through a comprehensive long-term plan connecting green spaces through ORM Natural Core and Linkage areas and potentially creating a Provincial Park.

Important to this process, Richmond Hill City Council approved a motion, on April 14, 2021, to evaluate the current state of the agricultural industry in northeast Richmond Hill as part of the ongoing Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) and requested that York Region do the same (Attachment 6). The motion also stated that Richmond Hill would encourage the Province to consider these MRCs in undertaking an evaluation of the Greenbelt policies, as provided for in Discussion Question 6, and ask the Province to assist in potentially creating a Provincial Park. Richmond Hill will also be making a submission to the Province as part of this consultation, as stated in the motion, to request the province study the redesignation of the Oak Ridges Moraine *Countryside* area. The purpose of this submission is to make those same requests on behalf of the LSLA. We ask that the province consider the MRCs in evaluating Greenbelt policies and the redesignation of Oak Ridges Moraine *Countryside* areas in northeast Richmond Hill, and assist in potentially creating a new Provincial Park within the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt.

ADDRESSING THE PRINCIPLES FOR GROWING THE GREENBELT EXPANSIONS

The request for Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt outlines Principles for Growing the Greenbelt Expansions. In consideration of these principles, as described above, for the northeast Richmond Hill area, it is important to keep in mind that the Oak Ridges Moraine Policies are applicable and that the four land use designations under the ORMCP apply. Therefore, through a Municipal Comprehensive Review, the change from one ORMPC designation to another is appropriate and consistent with the intent of the policies. Growing the Greenbelt can effectively be carried out through a comprehensive land use analysis, and resulting Plan, that incorporates various land use types that provide for protection and expansion of ORMCP Linkage and Core Areas, along with appropriately located Settlement Areas that support other important Provincial priorities in the Provincial Policy Statement and A Place to Grow.

CONCLUSION

MPlan Inc. and the LSLA are aligned with provincial priorities on these matters and are working with the City of Richmond Hill and the Region of York by providing input to their respective Municipal Comprehensive Reviews. Through these MCR processes, the opportunity exists to Grow the Greenbelt through the new, updated Official Plans, while

balancing other important Provincial priorities through proper and balanced land use planning.

We would also appreciate and request the opportunity to meet with the appropriate provincial staff to discuss this complex matter further. In this regard we would appreciate a response to our submission in order for us to follow up with MMAH staff for this purpose in the near future. Thank you for considering our submission.

Yours truly,



MPLAN Inc.

Per: Michael S. Manett, MCIP, RPP.

Encl.



ATTACHMENT 1

LESLIE STOUFFVILLE LANDOWNERS ASSOCIATION OWNERSHIP MAP

APRIL 2021


5-02

54-15

8-04

-04

128-04



ATTACHMENT 2

AUG 02 '05 14:14 FR OMAF-BRIGHTON

613 475 3835 TO 919058953482

Appendix	D
SRPD.	05-160
File(s)	DLO-ORM

SEP 20 06 (FRI) 08:34 LAND USE PLAN'G OMAF

TEL: 416 326 3065



Ministry of
Agriculture
and Food

Ministère de
l'Agriculture et
de l'Alimentation

Legislative Buildings
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 2B2

Hôtel du gouvernement
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 2B2

LAND USE PLANNING BRANCH

(416) 326-3118
(416) 326-3065 (FAX)

August 27, 1994

John Livey
Commissioner of Planning
Region of York Planning Department
17250 Yonge Street, Box 147
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 6Z1

Dear Mr. Livey:

Re: Map 6 to the Region of York Official Plan

I would like to provide you with some preliminary comments on the schedule designating the Agriculture and Rural areas. As you know we provided a draft copy to your staff in May of this year outlining those areas we felt would be provincially significant. Your staff were not able to send a response in time to conduct a meaningful review of the schedule prior to your council date.

Our suggestion would be that the Region consider a further breakdown in the agriculture designation to an Agriculture 1 and an Agriculture 2. York has such a diverse agriculture character that putting all the lands that are shown as agriculture into the same designation could water down the strength of the policies. In any case, the lands that you have included cover all the areas of provincial concerns and so we have not objected to the schedule. This agreement is based on the assurances from you that some refinement of the map will take place when the local official plans are updated.

In the meantime it is important that you are aware of those areas where there is a known provincial interest in the agriculture designation and so I have enclosed a map illustrating this. In a normal review for an official plan these boundaries would be reviewed with the local municipalities for their input. At the request of Mr. Waller, this has not been done in York. This map is intended to show where you can expect to have staff of this Ministry applying provincial policy.



Ontario, there's no taste like home
L'un bon goût de chez nous





This schedule will be used by staff of this Ministry until the additional work on the schedule is done by the local municipalities or your staff. We would be pleased to work with the local municipalities as they take on this task.

I trust this clarifies our position.

Yours truly,

Sharon Johnston
Sharon Johnston
District Manager

cc. Land Use Specialist, Newmarket


h/ly/ky.d



SEP. 20 96 (FR.) 09:29 LAND USE PLAN'G OMAF

TEL: 416 326 3065

P.032



Map 6

Agriculture and Rural Area

Agriculture Policy Area

Rural Policy Area (No Exes GreenSpace)



Agriculture Policy Area



No Land Marsh

August 19, 94





ATTACHMENT 3



Ministry of Agriculture and Food

R.R. #3, 95 Dundas St.,
Brighton, Ontario K0K 1H0
Tel: (613) 475-4784
Fax: (613) 475-3835

Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation

R.R. #3, 95 rue Dundas
Brighton, Ontario K0K 1H0
Tél.: (613) 475-4784
Télééc.: (613) 475-3835

**Resources Management Branch
Agricultural Land Use Unit**

July 24, 2002

Barbara Jeffrey
Principal Planner
Planning and Development Services Department
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 6Z1

Dear Barbara:

Subject: Provincially Significant Agricultural Areas as per the PPS for York Region

OMAF staff have identified provincially significant agricultural areas as per the PPS for the Towns of East Gwillimbury, Georgina, & Whitchurch-Stouffville, and for the Township of King. Maps identifying these areas are attached.

Provincially significant agricultural areas also lie within the City of Vaughan and the Town of Markham. These agricultural areas have not been verified as per the PPS. OMAF staff would be pleased to verify these provincially significant agricultural areas.

No provincially significant agricultural areas were identified within the Towns of Richmond Hill, Newmarket, and Aurora.

Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me at 613-475-4764.

Yours truly,

Ray Valaitis
Rural Planner





ATTACHMENT 4

Agenda Item 3.2



TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL

COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

SEPTEMBER 5, 2007

SRPD.07.086

Planning and Development
Planning

SUBJECT: Request for Comments – Proposed Official Plan Amendment to amend Official Plan Amendment No. 218 – the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Conformity Amendment - File No. D10-ORM-CPI (SRPD.07.086)

PURPOSE:

The proposed Official Plan Amendment to amend Official Plan Amendment No. 218 – the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Conformity Amendment to allow “major recreational uses” on lands designated “Countryside Area”.

RECOMMENDATION:

- a) That Section 2.2.1.10.20.2 of Official Plan Amendment No. 218 be amended to add as a permitted use “Major recreational uses subject to the policies of Section 38 of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.”
- b) That Official Plan Amendment No. 244, attached as Appendix ‘A’ be forwarded to the Region of York for approval.

Contact: Salvatore Aiello, Acting Manager of Site Plans, extension 2471

Submitted by:


Approved by:

Ana Bassios
Commissioner of Planning and Development

M. Joan Anderton
Chief Administrative Officer



Location Map





BACKGROUND:

The approval of Official Plan Amendment No. 218 by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing issued on March 9, 2006 did not include specific policies to permit “major recreational uses” within the Countryside Area designation. See Map 1 - Schedule 13 to OPA 218.

As way of background, the Ministry Staff, in a letter dated June 11, 2004, provided comments on the original draft of OPA 218 and commented that “under the ORMCP, major recreational uses (ie. Golf courses, ski hills, etc) are listed as a permitted use within the Countryside Area designation subject to the provisions of Section 38 in the ORMCP. We note however that OPA 218 has chosen not to include this specific use under Section 2.2.1.10.20.2 (ORM Countryside Area) and therefore does not include any specific policy requirements.”

“Major recreational uses” were not included in the original draft of OPA 218 because Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41 designated the Countryside Area within the Town as an “Agricultural Policy Area” which prohibits “major recreational uses” on prime agricultural lands.

On July 18, 2005 and again on July 25, 2005 the Town’s Council considered and endorsed modifications to OPA 218, including the addition of “major recreational use” as a permitted use within the Countryside Area. In order further facilitate this use, the Town applied for a Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA 50) to remove the “Agricultural Policy Area” designation which precludes “major recreational uses” within the Countryside Area. Attached as Appendix ‘B’ are the extracts from the meetings of Committee of the Whole and Council.

On June 21, 2006 ROPA 50 was approved and has the effect of re-designating the “Agricultural Policy Area” designation to “Rural Policy Area”. This change in designation was approved on the basis that no Provincially significant agricultural areas exist within the Town, the fragmented ownership of lots having less than 100 acres in size and the existence of non-agricultural uses such as golf courses, aggregate operations, a composting facility, parkland and pockets of rural residential uses.

Summary Analysis

Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan identifies four land use designations including Natural Core Areas, Natural Linkage Areas, Countryside Areas and Settlement Areas. Major recreational uses are not allowed within the Natural Core Area or Natural Linkage Area designations. The ORMCP states that Countryside Areas are “areas of rural use such as agricultural, recreation, residential development, Rural Settlements, mineral aggregate operations, parks and open space.” The policies of the ORMCP specifically lists “major recreational uses” as permitted uses within the Countryside area designation.



Section 38 of the ORMCP defines *Major Recreational Uses* as “uses that require large-scale modification to terrain, vegetation or both and usually also require large-scale buildings or structures, including but not limited to the following: 1) golf courses, 2) serviced playing fields, 3) serviced campgrounds and 4) ski hills.”

Section 13(5) of the ORMCP prohibits “major recreational uses” in prime agricultural areas and areas designated primarily for agricultural uses in the applicable official plan. As noted above, ROPA 50 states that no Provincially significant agricultural areas exist within the Town of Richmond Hill. As a result of ROPA 50, the inclusion of “major recreational uses” within OPA 218 would comply with the requirements of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41 brings the Regional Official Plan into conformity with the ORMCP. Section 2.5 Oak Ridges Moraine incorporates policies with respect to the Natural Core Area, Natural Linkage Area, Countryside Area and Settlement Area designations in conformity with the ORMCP. With respect to the Countryside Areas, ROPA 41 states that these are “areas of existing rural land uses which may include agricultural, major recreational, Hamlets, mineral aggregate operations, park and open space.” The inclusion of “major recreational uses” within OPA 218 would comply with the requirements of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41.

Official Plan Amendment No. 218

The specific issue at hand is that “major recreational uses” are not permitted within the Countryside Area designation under Official Plan Amendment 218 in accordance with Section 13(3) and 13(5) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the policies of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41. The inclusion “major recreational uses” as allowable uses not only complies with the stated intent of the ORMCP and ROPA 41 but also recognizes that significant recreational uses including golf courses and major parkland facilities exist within the Countryside Areas. Given that the Town’s defined urban areas present limited possibilities for the establishment of new recreational facilities, the inclusion of “major recreational uses” in OPA 218 provides an opportunity for the future as the Town’s population grows and need for actively used parkland facilities are warranted.

At the July 9, 2007 Council Meeting, various modifications to By-law 128-04 – the implementing zoning by-law for the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan were considered and adopted. The modifications to By-law 128-04 included development provisions that allows for “major recreational uses” within those lands zoned “Oak Ridges Moraine Countryside (ORMCO) Zone.” Permitting “major recreational uses” in the Zoning By-law recognizes existing facilities such a Bloomington Downs Golf Course and Phyllis Rawlinson Park. The proposed modification to OPA 218 is in conformity with Council’s intent to allow “major recreational uses” within the Countryside Area. It is anticipated that the Ministers approval of By-law 128-04 will be in compliance wit OPA 244.



Staff recommends that Section 2.2.1.10.20.2 of Official Plan Amendment No. 218 be amended to add as a permitted use “major recreational uses as described in Section 33 of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.” Attached as Appendix ‘A’ is a copy of proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 244 which would modify OPA 218 to include “major recreational uses” as permitted uses within the Countryside Area designation.

CONFORMITY WITH THE OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ PROTECTION ACT AND THE OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ CONSERVATION PLAN:

The addition of “major recreational uses” within Section 2.2.1.10.20.2 of OPA 218 is in conformity with Section 13(3) and 13(5) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

The recommendation does not have any financial or other implications.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:

There are no direct implications with respect to the Strategic Plan.

CONCLUSIONS:


The policies of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and those of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 41 recognize that “major recreational uses” are appropriate land uses within the designated Countryside Area. The proposed amendment to OPA 218 recognizes the existing situation and the future potential need for major recreational facilities within the Town of Richmond Hill. It is therefore recommended that proposed OPA 244, attached as Appendix ‘A’ be adopted by Town Council and forwarded to the Region of York for approval.

Council's emerging direction...

Refine Provincial
Prime
Agricultural Area
designation

Expand
Settlement Area
into ORM
Countryside

Create a new
employment area
along Hwy 404



Support Regional
refinement of
Provincial Prime
Agricultural Area



Request expansion
of the City's urban
boundary to include
lands designated
ORM Countryside
south of Bethesda
Sideroad



Request
Minister's Zoning
Order for new
Employment area



ATTACHMENT 6



MEMBER MOTION

Section 5.4.4(b) of Procedure By-law

Meeting:	Council ✓
Meeting Date:	Wednesday April 14, 2021
Subject/Title:	Review of farming and Agriculture in Richmond Hill
Submitted by:	Councillor Tom Muench

Whereas, the Province of Ontario is asking for input into the greenbelt expansion and needs (CONSULTATION ON GROWING THE SIZE OF THE GREENBELT) by April 19, 2021;

Whereas, the farming community has encountered significant challenges to continuing its agricultural businesses in Richmond Hill's northeast sector as a result of the approval of the urban West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plans resulting in:

- a. development that is encroaching into, and surrounded, farmland;
- b. York Region's road widening and urbanization of Leslie Street and its proposed realignment that has created traffic congestion which has made the operation of farming machinery on local roads a SAFETY CONCERN;
- c. the creation of two new GO Stations with significant infrastructure investment driving further urbanization of the area;
- d. light pollution from urban uses causing substantive challenges to ongoing farming operations; and
- e. the loss of the economic support system for the area farms and the agricultural industry in the area with very little support for these farming operations as it did 20 years ago; and

Whereas, there is very little cropland and innovative production farming is no longer economically viable, with only a few actual farms remaining in the area; and

Whereas, the soil conditions in the area are poor for farming and the lands are not "prime agricultural lands" as the Region and Province have indicated; and

Whereas, the arbitrary sterilization of lands through the current **Countryside** designation restricts the opportunity for the farming operations to relocate to other more viable jurisdictions to carry on the industry and family farming businesses elsewhere in the Region and Province; and

Whereas, farming and the agriculture business across all areas of York Region and the Province are not the same and a “one size fits all” policy is entirely inappropriate; and

Whereas, soils, urbanization, economic viability, traffic, safety concerns and good long term planning should be taken into account here for the long-term use of farm land and considerations should be made to engage with direct consultation of farmland owners when land policies and land designations are being asserted;

Therefore, be it resolved that the City of Richmond Hill;

1. **Support** the future of **traditional farming** by evaluating the current farming situation in the Northeast area of the City through its Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) **by studying** the re-designation of Oak Ridges Moraine **Countryside** lands around and including the Gormley GO Station MTSA;
2. **Request** that York Region do the same **evaluation** during its current Municipal Comprehensive Review; and
3. **Provide input** to the Province related to the Provincial Consultation on Growing the Greenbelt by requesting that the Province study the re-designation of Oak Ridges Moraine **Countryside**; and
4. **Encourage** the Province of Ontario take the input from these MCR's and carry out a proper evaluation of the Greenbelt Policies as provided for in its Question 6 related to “Other priorities that should be considered; and
5. **Ask** the Province of Ontario to assist wherever possible to link designations and **consider collaborative approaches** including creating a provincial park to create a linear park system within the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt; and
6. Send a copy of **this** resolution to York Regional Council, Members of Provincial Parliament (M.P.P.s) in York Region, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Transportation

Moved by: Councillor Tom Muench

Seconded by: Regional Councillor Carmine Perrelli

ATTACHMENT 1C



Gormley GO Community Study

Ryerson University Planning Student Report

April 2021

1.0 Introduction

A BRIEF REPORT OF THE
CURRENT AND FUTURE
POTENTIAL OF THE LANDS
SURROUNDING GORMLEY GO
STATION.

AUTHORS:

AZAR DAVIS

RYAN KYLE

AKASH KAR

BENJAMIN TRUONG

DEREK MCMURDIE

JASMINE MALHI

KARA POLLOCK

ROSLYN VIJAYAKUMAR

SAMUEL DENIS

SINA ZEKRIA

STEPHANIE CHAN

The purpose of this report is to examine the viability of the ongoing agricultural operations and the current land use policies governing the agricultural lands surrounding the Gormley GO rail station in Richmond Hill, Ontario, on behalf of MPlan Inc. (“the Client”). The Client is providing representation for the Leslie Stouffville Landowners Association (“LSLA”), a group of landowners in the area seeking redesignation and inclusion into the urban area of the lands as part of York Region’s and the City of Richmond Hill’s ongoing Municipal Comprehensive Review processes.

The majority of the subject lands (LSLA-owned parcels) are designated Countryside under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”), which limits the potential use of the properties owned by members of the LSLA. Since the Plan’s original inception in 2001, Metrolinx, the provincial transit authority for southern Ontario, has constructed the Gormley heavy rail commuter station which has been in operation since 2016. This, and other forms of urban infrastructure, has attracted significant development and population growth in the area, which has negatively impacted the LSLA’s ability to perform regular agricultural operations in the area.

This report will provide the historical, social, and legal context of the lands to determine the appropriateness of maintaining agricultural protections within the vicinity of the GO station and provide information and recommendations to the Client and associated stakeholders.

This report was created for evaluation as part of the undergraduate Urban and Regional Planning program at Ryerson University under the supervision of Professor David Amborski.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	2
Executive Summary	4
Primary Analysis	6
2.0 Context - Subject Lands	7
2.1 Servicing and Utilities	8
3.0 Policy Analysis	9
Secondary Factors	20
4.0 Transportation Factors	21
5.0 Environmental Factors	27
6.0 Economic Factors	38
7.0 Stakeholder Factors	44
Wider Context (Richmond Hill & Beyond)	49
8.0 Social Factors	50
Conclusions	53
9.0 Recommendations	54
References	56
Appendices	60

Executive Summary



Gormley GO

Critical to the analysis's understanding is the location of Gormley GO station, a regional transit stop in Richmond Hill, west of provincial Highway 404, and centered in the subject area.

This study seeks to analyze the policy framework specific to the lands, the context of the lands in their existing form, some initial considerations regarding the lands and their relationship to the Municipality and Region, as well as the ongoing viability of the agricultural operations. The report concludes with a series of recommendations for relevant stakeholders.

Purpose

The subject lands are a combined 500 acres of land owned by the members of the LSLA in the City of Richmond Hill. The majority of the lands are designated Countryside Area under the ORMCP, which generally restricts its use to agriculture.

The lands have been farmed for over 200 years, primarily by the Doner family; however, development over the last 20 years has surrounded the lands, causing significant impacts upon farming viability due to fragmentation and increased traffic, which imposes health and safety risks when moving equipment between properties.

The Client is seeking to expand the City's urban area to include the LSLA lands and redesignate them to Settlement Area under the ORMCP to permit development. In support, the Client has prepared a Community Area Development Plan proposal for the area.

Key Findings

The ORMCP has previously identified the lands as being within a highly vulnerable aquifer. Comprehensive environmental analysis by the City and the Region should therefore be carried out to determine the appropriate long-term use for the subject lands through the ongoing MCR process (see **9.0 Recommendations**).

Due to the eroded viability of farm operations, the Project Team recommends that the area be studied as part of the City's and Region's ongoing Municipal Comprehensive Review process to determine whether it is appropriate to maintain the lands for long-term agricultural use, or consider them for urban development and inclusion into the Settlement Area.

Redesignation of the lands for urban development is permitted by the policies of the ORMCP. However, the inclusion of the subject lands into the Settlement Area must ultimately be justified by way of a Lands Needs Assessment ("LNA"), as per s. 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan.

Primary Analysis




Figure 1: Study area delineated by pink line.

Context of the Subject Lands

Policy Analysis

2.0 Context - Subject Lands

The study area is located in the northeast portion of the City of Richmond Hill near the borders of the Towns of Aurora and Whitchurch-Stouffville in York Region. The focus area for this study is bounded by Bethesda Sideroad to the north, Highway 404 to the east, Leslie Street to the west, and 19th Avenue to the south (**Figure 1**). The area's character is rural, with large parcels of farmland surrounded by low-density settlement areas (**Figure 3**). The subject lands within the study area make up an approximate total area of 500 acres.

In the center of the study area are a part of Gormley's rural settlement area, a hamlet of houses, and the aforementioned GO rail station, and a GO

train overnight parking and staging yard. Despite the apparent rural nature of the area, traffic congestion along the bounding arterial roads is significant during peak hours. Due to the Gormley GO location within the City, the station is primarily utilized by those who commute to the station by private vehicles before boarding the train to travel southbound for work in other areas. Despite its location, the Gormley GO station's ridership rates have gradually increased over time, though it remains a station of relatively low ridership on the Richmond Hill line. According to Metrolinx, the station maintained a daily average ridership of 690 riders in 2019, a 17.6% increase from the previous year (Metrolinx, 2019).



Figure 2: A view looking east onto the Doner Farm from Leslie Avenue, south of Stouffville Road. Retrieved from Google Maps.

2.1 Servicing and Utilities

The study area is currently served by a two-lane paved roadway, Leslie Street (north/south), with connections to major east/west roadways at 19th Ave to the south, Bethesda Sideroad to the north, and Stouffville Road running centrally through the area. A recent study of Leslie Street, the Leslie Street EA project number 99804 (York Region, 2020a), proposed widening the street through the study area from two lanes to 4 lanes and realigning the connection to Stouffville Road. More road improvements are planned near the study area on Stouffville road in 2025, as noted in the approved 2019 to 2022 budget (York Region, 2019a, p.57).

With regards to water and wastewater services, the same budget shows maps on page 86 and 87 of current and future capital projects. Our research team has been unable to access municipal water main and trunk sewer maps to confirm local municipality services in the study area, however, a new development on the west side of Leslie included in the West Gormley Secondary Plan is serviced by water connections running from Bayview Avenue and sanitary services along Leslie Street north to Bethesda Road.



Figure 3: Aerial view above the Gormley GO station, denoted by red star. Retrieved from Google Maps.

3.0 Policy Analysis

The following subsections contain policy analysis of the following provincial, regional, and local planning policies applicable to the subject lands:

- Provincial Policy Statement (2020);
- Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017);
- Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019);
- Greenbelt Plan (2017);
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority guidelines;
- 2041 Regional Transportation Plan (2018);
- York Region Official Plan (2010);
- City of Richmond Hill Official Plan (2010); and
- Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan (2000).

The Transit Oriented Communities Act (2020) will not be considered as part of this report, as it only applies to specific planned rapid transit expansions prescribed under the Act.

3.1 Provincial Policy Statement

The Provincial Policy Statement (“PPS”) is a province-wide policy document that provides high-level policy direction for all land use planning and development matters in Ontario. It broadly specifies how development shall take place to align

with Provincial interests, which includes creating thriving and sustainable communities.

Section 2.3 of the PPS emphasizes the importance of preserving prime agricultural lands as identified by planning authorities for the long term, however, it is difficult to achieve in the context of the Gormley GO area due to recent population growth. Therefore, one such method to sustainably support current and future growth, including economic and transportation developments, is for the Region to investigate the feasibility of redesignating the lands to Settlement Areas as part of the ongoing municipal comprehensive review (“MCR”).

3.2 Greenbelt Plan

The Greenbelt Plan is a provincial-level document that adds further protection to the agricultural, ecological and hydrological features of the lands not protected by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”) and the Niagara Escarpment Plan (“NEP”), in order to identify where urbanization shall not occur in other environmentally significant areas. Lands outside of the ORMCP and NEP are designated protected countryside under the Greenbelt Plan. These are further divided into four sections: agricultural system, natural system, parkland open space and trails, and settlement areas.

Often, policies within the Greenbelt Plan become

confused with the policies outlined in the ORMCP. However, the protected countryside policies within the Greenbelt Plan do not apply to areas within the ORMCP, NEP, Parkway Belt West Plan (“PBWP”), and the lands within the Urban River Valley Area, as stated in s. 2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan:

“The requirements of the ORMCP (Ontario Regulation 140/02), made under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, continue to apply and the Protected Countryside policies do not apply, with the exception of section 3.3.”

In the context of this policy, the ORMCP is the prevailing provincial-level document on the subject lands.

3.3 Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”) provides policy direction for land use and resource management for the lands and waters located within the designated boundaries of the Oak Ridges Moraine. The Plan divides the Moraine into four separate land use categories: Natural Core Areas (38% of the land area), Natural Linkage Areas (24%), Countryside Areas (30%), and Settlement Areas (8%).

As per the land use designation map under the Plan (**Figure 4**), the majority of the lands surrounding the Gormley GO Station are within the Countryside

Area designation. This designation is inclusive of rural land uses such as agriculture, recreation, residential development, rural settlements, mineral aggregate operations, parks and open space (s. 10[1.3]).

Section 13 of the Plan states that the purpose of Countryside Areas is to encourage agricultural and other rural uses that support the Plan’s overall objectives. Specifically, s. 13(b) and (c) highlight that this is to be done by promoting and protecting agricultural and other rural land uses and normal farm practices, as well as maintaining the rural character of the rural settlements.

As determined through this study, the area surrounding the Gormley GO Station can no longer continue “normal farm practices,” or maintain the rural character of a rural settlement area due to recent intensification in the form of subdivision developments which have surrounded the subject lands. Surrounding the LSLA lands is the West Gormley Community Area, the North Leslie Secondary Plan Area and the Gormley Community. Both the West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plan areas are designated Settlement Areas with the Gormley Community Area designated as Rural Settlement.

Figure 4 illustrates the Oak Ridges Moraine Designations with the area of the study as outlined. Due to the traffic generated by surrounding developments and neighbouring municipalities, normal farming practices are no longer possible.

Section 18(1)(0.a) states the purpose of Settlement




Figure 4: Land use designations of neighbouring developments (bound in yellow) under the ORMCP. Study area bound in red.

Areas is to focus and contain growth by encouraging the development of communities that provide their residents with convenient access to an appropriate mix of employment, transportation options and local public service facilities. In the context of the study area, the Gormley GO Station has to potential to encourage an appropriate mix of amenities outlined in the policy through transit-oriented development.

Section 18 (b) and (c) also states the purpose of Settlement Areas is to focus urban growth by promoting the efficient use of land with transit-supportive densities, through intensification and

redevelopment within existing urban areas and providing for the continuation and development of urban land uses consistent with growth management strategies in an applicable official plan.

In the context of the subject lands, the area would benefit from investigation through the ongoing MCR processes, as it is within a to-be-designated major transit station area (“MTSA”). The purpose of the MTSA designation under the Growth Plan is to intensify areas surrounding stations with residents and jobs to encourage transit use. Studying the redesignation potential of the subject lands may

allow for the development of a new community to take advantage of existing public infrastructure.

The Implementation section of the ORMCP grants upper-tier or single tier municipalities the power to implement boundary changes to countryside areas as part of a Municipal Comprehensive Review, in accordance with policy 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan, as long as expansion does not occur in Natural Core Areas or Natural Linkage Areas:

An upper-tier or single-tier municipality may consider the need to change or refine the boundaries of Settlement Areas as part of a municipal comprehensive review undertaken in accordance with policy 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Settlement Area boundaries are not permitted to expand into Natural Core Areas or Natural Linkage Areas.

Redesignation of the LSLA lands from Countryside to Settlement Area would therefore be in accordance with policies outlined in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Any potential redesignation would allow for more contextually appropriate-land uses on the subject lands, as farming practices are no longer feasible.

3.4 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The subject lands are designated Greenbelt Area, as the Growth Plan does not provide policies for areas covered by Provincial environmental land use plans outside the built-up area.

Section 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan contains the specific regulations regarding Settlement Area Boundary Expansions, with several important subsections: Section 2.2.8.1 states that the boundaries shall be described according to regional official plans (s. 2.2.8.1). Similarly, section 2.2.8.3(j) states that, “the proposed expansion would meet any applicable requirements of the Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation, Niagara Escarpment, and Lake Simcoe Protection Plans and any applicable source protection plan,” meaning that the aforementioned regulations also take priority in the event of any conflict with the Growth Plan.

This is continued in section 2.2.8.3(k), which contains restrictions for settlement area development within protected countryside areas that are in the vicinity of the Greenbelt. Any expansion on these lands must satisfy the following conditions:

1. *The settlement area to be expanded is identified in the Greenbelt Plan as a Town/Village;*

2. *The proposed expansion would be modest in size, representing no more than a 5% increase in the geographic size of the settlement area based on the settlement area boundary delineated in the applicable official plan as of July 1st, 2017, up to a maximum size of 10 hectares, and residential development would not be permitted on more than 50 % of the lands that would be added to the settlement area;*
3. *The proposed expansion would support the achievement of complete communities or the local agricultural economy;*
4. *The proposed uses cannot be reasonably accommodated within the existing settlement area boundary;*
5. *The proposed expansion would be serviced by existing municipal water and wastewater systems without impacting future intensification opportunities in the existing settlement area; and*
6. *Expansion into the Natural Heritage System that has been identified in the Greenbelt Plan is prohibited.*

In the latest Land Needs Assessment undertaken by the Region presented to Council in March 2021, the LSLA lands were not included in the proposed boundary expansion to accommodate population growth over the time horizon of the Growth Plan (York Region, 2021).

3.5 Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

The subject lands are within the Rouge River Watershed, and are in close proximity to the River's floodplain to the west. These significant areas are shown in the natural features visualization in **Figure 5**.

Due to the proximity of the subject lands to these nearby watersheds, any potential development will require adherence to the development guidelines and policies listed within the TRCA's Living City Policies ("LPC"). The LPC is primarily intended to protect both life and properties from potential flooding and erosion threats, as well as to guide the TRCA's responsibilities within the planning and development approval processes (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 2021).




Figure 5: Natural features in the Gormley GO area. Study area delineated in pink.

3.6 Metrolinx 2041 Regional Transportation Plan

The 2041 Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) was adopted in 2018 by Metrolinx, the regional public transit agency for the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (“GTHA”) and operator of GO Transit under

the Ministry of Transportation.

As a non-statutory document, the purpose of the Plan is to establish a strategic and harmonised direction for transit investments and capital projects among various transit operators and municipal stakeholders across the Region. The Plan consists of 38 supportive priority actions for Metrolinx to lead in order to achieve its five strategies: Complete, Connect, Optimise, Integrate, and Prepare the regional transit system.

The intent of Strategy 4, Integrate, is to promote

and coordinate the integration of land use with public transit, and reiterates the importance of station area planning to maximise investments made in the public transit system as directed by the Growth Plan.

In practice, the goal of this strategy is to encourage a mix of designations which promote transit-supportive densities surrounding rail corridors. Studying the redesignation potential of the subject lands would support the goals of the RTP by allowing for the potential development and establishment of a complete community in the Gormley GO MTSA, helping to support ridership along the Richmond Hill line through the potential development of a complete community.

3.7 York Region Official Plan

The current Official Plan was adopted in 2010, and the Region is currently undergoing a Municipal Comprehensive Review (“MCR”) to update the Official Plan policies. This section analyses the viability of redesignating the subject lands to urban areas as part of the review process.

Section 6 of the Plan focuses on the agricultural and rural areas within the Region to create policies that work concurrently with the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”). As 69% of York Region is within the boundaries of the Greenbelt Plan, including the Oak Ridges Moraine, the Region undertook a Land

Evaluation Review prior to the adoption of the current Plan to analyze the Canada Land Inventory soil capability, fragmentation by non-farm uses, conflicting uses, and current production. The LSLA lands are primarily designated rural areas (**Figure 6**).

Section 6.4.5 of the Official Plan states that applications for redesignation of lands within the rural area are subject to compliance with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Greenbelt Plan and applicable Official Plan policies. The OP outlines further requirements for such applications as stated below:

- *That the proposed use is appropriate in the Rural Area when considered in the context of Provincial Plans and local official plans;*
- *That the proposed use will not adversely impact the ability of adjacent agricultural activities to undertake normal farm practices;*
- *That the proposed water and wastewater servicing is appropriate for the type of use; and,*
- *That there are no negative impacts on key natural heritage or hydrologic features and functions, biodiversity or connectivity of the Regional Greenlands System.*

The redesignation of the subject lands from rural areas to settlement areas comply with policies set out in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Greenbelt Plan, and the applicable official plans, pending further study. Given the surrounding context and potential of the subject lands, comprehensive study of the area as part of the Region’s MCR process would be appropriate.




Figure 6: A snapshot of the Agricultural and Rural Areas identified by York Region. Study area delineated by red line.

The change of use on the subject lands would not further adversely impact the ability of adjacent agricultural activities to undertake normal farm practices, as the area is surrounded by existing and expanding development. In its current state, farmers working on the lands do not have the ability to undertake normal farm practices due to the adverse impact from and conflict with surrounding settlement areas, which highlights the need for the area to be studied. The third requirement will be provided for in any potential future development proposals.

The fourth requirement for redesignation application, to demonstrate no negative impacts on key natural heritage features and functions, biodiversity or connectivity can be determined by further study through the ongoing MCR process. It is currently unknown what effect development on the subject lands may pose to hydrological functions in the Region, which is why a comprehensive study by both the Region and the City is required to determine the appropriate long-term land use in the area.

Section 6.2.9 further states that expansions are permitted subject to the existing provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan, local Official Plans and zoning by-laws and ensure expansion will not adversely affect the ecological integrity of the ORMCP Area.

That existing institutional uses and expansions are permitted subject to the Existing Use provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and local official plans and zoning by-laws. When

expansion of such uses is applied for, the applicant shall demonstrate that the expansion will not adversely affect the ecological integrity of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area.

Section 5 of the York Region Official Plan provides policies relating to growth and building complete communities. Section 5.1.12 outlines specific guidelines for expansions of urban areas, stating they must only be initiated by the region as part of a regional municipal comprehensive review, and be in conformity with policy 2.2.8 Growth Plan, and the following:

- *population and employment forecasts for the Region;*
- *the role of the lands proposed for expansion in the context of local municipal growth management;*
- *the protection of and integration with the Regional Greenlands System;*
- *the amendment is large enough (e.g. a concession block) with clear and identifiable boundaries, such as concession streets, major natural features, rail or major utility corridors;*
- *the role of the lands proposed for expansion that is supportive of the Region's urban structure, including centres and corridors, Regional Rapid Transit Corridors, and GO commuter rail line; that expansions of the Urban Area are contiguous to an existing Urban Area; the completion of local municipal strategies and policies to phase in and achieve the intensification targets in this Plan;*
- *the existing or planned infrastructure required to accommodate the proposed expansion can be provided in a financially and environmentally*

sustainable manner;

- *future expansions, to the Urban Area as shown on Map 1 of this Plan, are directed to lands outside the boundary of that Urban Area and outside the Greenbelt Plan Area Boundary;*
- *the Region and local municipalities shall protect for the opportunity for new community areas and employment lands within such lands that could be considered through any future municipal comprehensive review; and,*
- *other policies of this Plan.*

As discussed in section 3.4 of this report, any potential redesignation of the subject lands would conform with section 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan. Redesignation would also aid the Region in accommodating population and employment forecasts, as it would add housing stock and employment opportunities within proximity to higher-order transit. The redesignation area would also be of considerable size and would create a contiguous developed area. Redesignation of the subject lands from its current designation as rural areas to urban areas therefore complies with the policies outlined in this document.

3.8 Richmond Hill Official Plan

The Richmond Hill Official Plan (2010) provides direction in the City to guide planning and development activities, as well as directing the preparation of secondary plans to provide land use strategies for specific areas. The Plan has since been amended to include new Secondary

Plans in proximity to the study area, including West Gormley and North Leslie Secondary Plans. The City is currently undergoing a Municipal Comprehensive Review process to update their Official Plan policies, in accordance with the Region.

Section 3.1.2 notes how growth is to be managed within the municipality, however, it does not state anything about growth within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”) area. It acknowledges that the settlement areas will increase, showing that future growth may be completed within the ORMCP area, as long as the impact is limited.

Section 3.1.5 of the Plan states that new housing developments within the municipality will consist of a variety of more affordable housing types in order to improve the community. For employment, section 3.1.6 states that the municipality acknowledges the role that its employment land plays in its success and will prohibit their conversion. Section 3.3.3.1 notes that major employment centres should be located around rapid public transit. Over time, the area around the Gormley GO Station has the potential to become a major transportation hub for York Region, which would support employment in the areas around it in both Richmond Hill and neighbouring Whitchurch-Stouffville.

Due to Richmond Hill being partly located within the Oak Ridges Moraine, there are several policies in regards to preserving and using the Moraine as part of a greater greenway system through the municipality. Section 3.2.1 states the requirements that need to be met in order for a major

development to occur in the ORMCP area. These requirements include sewage and water plans that must maintain functionality of the ecosystem, including the preservation of both natural heritage and hydrological features, as well as conforming with the applicable watershed plan. However, development must be directed away from vital groundwater and surface water areas in order to avoid compromising the land's ecological integrity.

3.9 Policy Summary

The subject lands are not designated *Protected Countryside Area* under the Greenbelt Plan, as the Greenbelt Plan defers the authority of the subject lands to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan ("ORMCP") [Greenbelt Plan, 2017, s. 2.1]. The prevailing Provincial designation on the subject lands is therefore *Countryside Area* under the ORMCP.

The ability of lower- and upper-tier municipalities to expand their *Settlement Area* boundary into ORMCP *Countryside Area* is provided for by Settlement Area Expansions policies in the Plan. Currently, the land is designated as agricultural by the lower- and upper-tier official plans. While the Growth Plan discourages efforts to permit settlement area expansion into agricultural land (s. 2.2.8), in the context of the study area, the question turns to determining the continued viability of the lands for agricultural use.

If the land is deemed unsuitable for agriculture, then the first step in using the subject lands for development will be to have the *Prime Agricultural Areas* designation removed from the land by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs ("OMAFRA"), as municipalities are required to identify these areas in accordance with OMAFRA's identification. This change is to be initiated by local planning authorities through a settlement boundary expansion.

Any potential redesignation is in accordance with the all of the land use policies in effect on the subject lands, pending demonstration that:

- Urban expansion would pose no negative environmental impacts or additional agricultural impacts; and,
- that the need for a boundary expansion is required.

Secondary Factors



Transportation Factors

Environmental Factors

Economic Factors

Stakeholder Factors

4.0 Transportation Factors


4.1 Access to Public Transportation

Public transit is provided by both GO and York Region Transit services in Richmond Hill. Until the opening of Bloomington GO Station later this year, Gormley GO is the northern terminus of the Richmond Hill rail line. Train services at Gormley GO station only operate during peak periods to accommodate rush hour commuters. Outside of peak periods, rail service is replaced by GO bus Route 61 to connect the Richmond Hill line to Toronto’s Union Station (GO Transit, 2020). Prior to COVID-19, Gormley GO Station saw an average of 690 passengers per day between the period of

the Richmond Hill line found in Appendix 3D of the Plan. However, due to freight negotiations, the agency is only working to deliver more frequent rush hour services in the short-term. It is unclear when all-day GO rail service will be available at Gormley Station.

In order to provide context for the degree to which the area around the Gormley GO Station is currently utilized, a comparison between the Gormley GO Station and several other GO stations within York Region was made.

Although accessed a wide catchment area through automobile trips, the population within walking distance to Gormley GO station is significantly low relative to other GO stations in York Region. By analyzing estimated population ranges within a 15-minute walking radius (about 1.5 kilometres) around five GO stations within York Region, it is apparent that the land in close proximity to Gormley GO station is significantly less developed and less densely populated. The current estimated population within a 1.5-kilometre radius of Gormley GO station is between 100-200 residents, while the estimated population around stations such as Langstaff, Richmond Hill, Stouffville, and Mount Joy all exceed 4,000. The figures below highlight this anomaly.



April to December 2019 (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Average daily ridership of the Richmond Hill Line and Gormley GO Station. Retrieved from Metrolinx.

The Metrolinx 2041 Regional Transportation Plan identifies future two-way, all-day rail service on

In order to generate the population figures within 1.5 kilometres of each noted GO station, population estimates for dissemination and census



Figure 8: Population estimate within 1.5 (15 minute) walking distance of Mount Joy Station.

Figure 9: Population estimate within 1.5 (15 minute) walking distance of Langstaff Station.



Figure 10: Population estimate within 1.5 (15 minute) walking distance of Richmond Hill Station.

Figure 11: Population estimate within 1.5 (15 minute) walking distance of Stouffville Station.



Figure 12: Population estimate within 1.5 (15 minute) walking distance of Gormley Station




Figure 13: Map identifying public transit routes in proximity to the study area.

tract areas were utilized. By using the Centre for Spatial Economics and Environics Analytics’ 2020 population estimates by dissemination area instead of the more conventional census data, a more precise set of population data was obtained (The Centre for Spatial Economics and Environics Analytics, 2020). This helps to reflect the potential

change in population since the last census in 2016 (The Centre for Spatial Economics and Environics Analytics, 2021).

As shown in **Figure 13**, York Region Transit (“YRT”) does not connect the the study area to the wider urban area, nor does it currently operate any bus

routes which connect to the GO station. In the 2020 Transit Initiatives Report, YRT did not incorporate Gormley GO Station as part of their proposed Frequent Transit Network for 2025, or identify any future routes to connect the station or study area (York Region, 2020b).

YRT has focused the expansion of services in the vicinity along the Yonge Street corridor, where users can transfer to GO services through the Richmond Hill Centre Terminal and Finch GO Bus Terminal, providing connectivity to the Greater Toronto-Hamilton Area (“GTHA”). However, direct public transportation access within the study area is limited.



Figure 14: Map displaying Annual Average Daily Traffic data for Regional roads (York Region, 2011; York Region, 2015).*¹

¹ *Disclaimer: For the purpose of the study, specific datasets are presented in the format of maps or charts for analysis and interpretation of the subject site and its surrounding. Due to constraints of accessing regional traffic data, the following materials: Annual Average Daily Traffic data (2011&2015) and Transportation Tomorrow Survey data (2016) may not accurately reflect current conditions.

4.2 Traffic Volumes

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is a parameter to understand the average vehicle volume per day. As data are only available for regional and provincial roadways, AADT of municipal roads are not presented. Within the period of 2011-2015, the traffic volume of Regional roadways around the subject site remained consistent (**Figure 14**).

As for Provincial roadways, Highway 404 and Stouffville Road maintained a gradual growth throughout the period of 2001-2016 (**Figure 15**), with the exception of 2013 where severe weather events resulted in washed-out road conditions, causing significant traffic disruption across the GTHA. An increase of the traffic volume is foreseeable, current AADT has likely reached over 90,000 based on the observed trend.

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) 2001-2016

HWY 404 - YORK RD 14/STOUFFVILLE RD




Figure 15: AADT of provincial roadways between 2001-2016 surrounding the site. Data retrieved from Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2016)

In addition to AADT, York Region Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Addendum has indicated Traffic Volume of Leslie Street from 19th Avenue to Stouffville Road (York Region, 2019b). The report uses volume to capacity (v/c) ratio, the following measures to classify the level of services :

- $V/C < 0.80$ 'GoodD'
- $0.80 \leq V/C \leq 0.90$ 'Unstable'
- $0.90 \leq V/C \leq 1.00$ 'Congested'
- $V/C \leq 1.00$ 'Very Congested'

As seen from the table below, the 2016 results (years of study conducted) are considered to be in 'congested' conditions. Since the area is already operating in "Congested" condition, a two-lane cross-section of Leslie Street would not provide sufficient transportation capacity in the years of 2031 and 2041. The report suggested four-lane widening of Leslie Street from Stouffville Road to Elgin Mills Road is required by 2031, and additional capacity improvement measures are demanded by 2041. Transportations studies of the site indicated traffic growth could be one of the most important factors for potential developments on site.

Year	Screenline Location	Screenline Conditions for Various Leslie Street Cross-Sections					
		2-Lane (without widening)			4-Lane (with widening)		
		Total Capacity	Model Volume	V/C Ratio	Total Capacity	Model Volume	V/C Ratio
Existing (2016)	1 - South of Stouffville Road	8,100	8,047	0.99	-	-	-
	2 - South of 19th Avenue	8,100	8,777	1.08	-	-	-
	3 - North of Elgin Mills Road	9,100	8,660	0.95	-	-	-
2031	1 - South of Stouffville Road	10,200	11,062	1.08	11,000	11,322	1.03
	2 - South of 19th Avenue	11,200	12,098	1.08	12,000	12,402	1.03
	3 - North of Elgin Mills Road	11,200	11,278	1.01	12,000	11,490	0.96
2041	1 - South of Stouffville Road	10,200	11,708	1.15	11,000	12,128	1.10
	2 - South of 19th Avenue	11,200	13,357	1.19	12,000	13,865	1.16
	3 - North of Elgin Mills Road	11,200	12,240	1.09	12,000	12,619	1.05

Screenline Analysis Results (AM Peak Hour) for Alternative Scenarios. Data retrieved from York Region. 2019b]

5.0 Environmental Factors

5.1 Previous Environmental Assessments

Within the site boundaries of the study area, there have been two past environmental assessments; One located along Leslie Street between Stouffville Road and 19th Avenue (Regional Municipality of York, 2019a), and the other along Stouffville Road (York Region, 2017). Both of these assessments focused on the widening and improvement of these roads in order to support a larger number of vehicles due to secondary plans in the area, and

existing congestion. Potential widening of the roads may create opportunities for new developments in an area, where congestion is making it increasingly hard for farmers to move their equipment from field to field, which have become increasingly fragmented.

The assessment along Leslie Street was focused directly between two secondary plans, the West Gormley Secondary Plan to the north, and the North Leslie Secondary Plan to the south. The assessment was launched to address congestion issues on the two-lane major arterial roadway, create room for pedestrians and cyclists, accommodate for future growth in traffic volumes, and help improve the



Figure 16: Map of the proposed widening of Stouffville Road. Study area delineated in red. Retrieved from York Region.

natural environment (Regional Municipality of York, 2019a). With these changes being located within the Oak Ridges Moraine, the proposal has to follow the policies of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The assessment stated that any impacts must be minimized to meet the requirements of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.

For the environmental assessment along Stouffville Road, Segment 3 (**Figure 16**) falls within the study area. For the widening of Stouffville Road, the Assessment states that widening the northern side of the road is strongly preferred over the southern side when compared with the concerns of transportation engineering, the natural

environment, socio-economic environment, and the cultural environment (York Region, 2017). Staff noted that with the changes proposed to Stouffville Road, other means of transportation should be added, such as bike lanes or bus routes, that would help residents get to the Gormley GO Station.

5.2 Environmental Analysis

The following section is intended to provide an overview of available information related to soil, hydrology and natural heritage, and does not replace an environmental assessment report.




Figure 17: Soil and Contour Map



Figure 18: Soil Drainage Map. Study area delineated in red.

Soil Classifications

As shown in **Figure 17**, the majority of the soil on the LSLA lands is categorised as Chinguacousy Clay Loam, which is classified as Gleyed Gray Brown Luvisol. The drainage for this soil type is ‘imperfectly drained’, meaning water is removed from the soil slowly in relation to supply. This allows the soil to stay wet for a significant part of the growing season (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 1998).

Second to Chinguacousy Clay Loam, a significant portion of the LSLA lands are categorised as Peel Clay, which is classified as Podzolic Gray Brown Luvisol and has a similar drainage to Chinguacousy Clay Loam (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada,

1998). Lastly, a small portion of the LSLA lands are located on BottomLand Soils, classified as Gleyed Melanic Brunisol, which also has a similar imperfect drainage pattern (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 1998). **Figure 18** shows these soils and their drainage capability.

According to the Ministry, the LSLA lands are considered to be a Prime Agricultural Areas. **The OMAFRA describes Prime Agricultural Areas as large blocks of lands that enable current and future opportunities for agriculture, which is notably no longer consistent with the study area. The Ministry last updated its classification mapping in 2018, despite the fragmentation of**




Figure 19: CLI Soil Classification Map. Study area delineated in red. (ARDA Report No. 2, 1965)

agricultural lands.

Lands that are within the classes 1-3 in Canada Land Inventory (CLI), or are designated as specialty crop areas, or are areas with organic soil, are all considered Prime Agricultural Areas. The CLI classification system assesses and evaluates the quality of mineral soils based on three general characteristics; their productivity relative to all mineral soils in Ontario and Canada, their flexibility/the range of common field crops they are capable of producing, and their management needs with respect to necessary improvements and conservation practices for field crop production (Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs,

2021). The CLI system classifies mineral soils into seven groups.

“Classes 1-3 are considered capable of sustained production of cultivated field crops and are considered prime agricultural land resources. Class four is considered marginal for cultivated field crops. Class five is capable of hay production and permanent pasture use. The sixth is capable of sustaining unimproved pasture only and the seventh class has no agricultural capability”

As shown in **Figure 19**, the LSLA lands are located within class 1 of the CLI classification system, the highest quality soils for agricultural use. Class

1 soils are identified as nearly level, deep, well to imperfectly drained and have good nutrient and water holding capacity and can be managed and cropped without difficulty. Lands within this class are moderately high to high in productivity under good management. The CLI also determines subclasses which indicate the limitations to agriculture use on classified lands. There are no limitations that apply to the soil on LSLA subject lands.

There are more steps involved for a municipality to designate their lands as prime agricultural lands. Studies that involve analyzing maps and information such as the CLI classes, lot sizes to assess fragmentation, and the existing land uses to assess the degree of agricultural and non-agricultural uses in the area.

It is the responsibility of the municipality to designate Prime Agricultural Areas in their official plans and must ensure the full meaning of Prime Agricultural Areas as described by the OMAFRA is included in the designation area (Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs, 2021). Policies that regulate Prime Agricultural Areas are outlined in the Greenbelt Plan. The Greenbelt Plan has three types of geographic-specific policies that apply to the lands within the Protected Countryside: Agricultural System, Natural System, and Settlement Areas. The Agricultural System is then divided further into Prime Agricultural Areas, Specialty Crop Areas and Rural Lands. However, Section 2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan states the policies under Protected Countryside do not apply to lands within Oak Ridges Moraine Plan:

“The requirements of the ORMCP (Ontario Regulation 140/02), made under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, continue to apply and the Protected Countryside policies do not apply, with the exception of section 3.3.”

This is important to note because the subject lands are located within the boundaries of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, meaning any policies that are required for Prime Agricultural Areas does not apply to the subject lands, despite its inclusion in the designation by the OMAFRA.

Hydrological Conditions

The LSLA lands are a part of the Rouge River Watershed, which includes approximately 336km² of land and water in the Regions of York and Durham, Cities of Toronto, Markham, Richmond Hill and Pickering, and the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville (Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs, 2021). This watershed is vital to linking the environmental systems of Lake Ontario to the Oak Ridges Moraine within the GTA. At a smaller scale, the LSLA lands are within the Main Rouge subwatershed. **Figure 20** shows the location of the LSLA lands within the context of the Rouge River Watershed.

According to the TRCA Rouge River Watershed Report Card, the Main Rouge subwatershed is rated at a ‘C’ level for Surface Water Quality. This means there are higher concentrations of e.coli and phosphorus entering the waterway from a variety of sources, including overflows from combined sewers, septic systems, livestock and pet wastes, and the use of organic fertilizers (Toronto and



Figure 20: Location of the LSLA Lands within Watershed Boundaries. Study area delineated in red.

Region Conservation Authority, 2013). This poor scoring indicates that more active measures to control urban run-off may be required. The Main Rouge subwatershed has a large portion of urban areas with no storm water control in comparison to other subwatersheds within the Rouge River Watershed. The TRCA Rouge River Report Card is located in Appendix A. The TRCA recommends that development in the Rouge watershed should focus on low-impact development controls such as rain gardens, green roofs and permeable parking lots (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 2013).

Urbanization can increase the levels of non-

permeable cover, which can limit the amount of water that seeps into the ground. Rainfall is quickly piped and channeled directly into nearby water courses, instead of allowing precipitation to infiltrate the ground as it would naturally (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, n.d.). This creates impacts on annual flow trends over time. In the TRCA region, annual flow volumes are increasing from 0.3% to 2.9% in more urbanized areas (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, n.d.). Though the TRCA is putting effort into ensuring the use of channels in urban areas are decreased by allowing for natural methods of water infiltration, urbanized areas still have lasting effects on hydrology.




Figure 21: Map of aquifer vulnerability areas and watershed boundaries. Study area delineated in yellow.

The LSLA lands are within vulnerable areas. There are four types of vulnerable areas as defined in the Ontario Clean Water Act, 2006; Highly Vulnerable Aquifer, Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas, Intake Protection Zones and Wellhead Protection Zone. Certain parts of the LSLA lands are identified as areas of High Aquifer Vulnerability by the York Region and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”), shown in **Figure 21**.

Aquifers are the underground areas in which freshwater is found. Highly vulnerable aquifers are identified depending on the underground depth and the type of soil or rock covering or surrounding the area. If the soil level above an aquifer is thin, it is more vulnerable to contamination, and is

identified as a vulnerable aquifer. **Figure 22** also shows specific areas of highly vulnerable Aquifers as identified by the York Region.

According to the York Region and ORMCP plans, some portions of the LSLA lands are also within Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (**Figure 23**). This means the lands have a vulnerability rating of medium to high.

Groundwater Recharge Areas are areas where there is a high volume of water moving from the surface level, into the ground and recharging aquifers. Recharge Areas will often have permeable soil which allows water to easily seep into the ground, examples of this being sand or gravel. Although the LSLA lands are primarily clay and clay loam




Figure 22: Map of highly vulnerable aquifers in York Region. Study area delineated in yellow.

lands, which are the lesser permeable soils, the subject lands still have relatively high infiltration of water rates. The Ontario Soil Complex Categorizes infiltration rates from A soils, which have highest infiltration, to D soils, with the lowest infiltration rate and highest water runoff rate. As shown in **Figure 24**, the LSLA lands are located within B and C soil categories. B soils have moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet and C soils have a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet.

A Significant Groundwater Recharge Area designation can only be applied to areas that have a hydrological connection to a surface water body or an aquifer that is a source of drinking water for a drinking water system (Province of Ontario, n.d.). As the site is located within a Significant

Groundwater Recharge Area, this is of concern.

Policies within the York Region Official Plan relating to vulnerable areas are found in section 7.3.51, where the Region prohibits hazardous waste, waste disposal sites, organic soil conditioning sites and snow storage and disposal facilities, underground and aboveground storage tanks that are not equipped with a secondary containment device, and storage of a contaminant listed in schedules to Ontario Regulations. The same policy is repeated in sections 3.2.1.1 (35), (36), and (37) of the Richmond Hill Official Plan. Section 29 (5) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan also prohibits the same uses as described above. These policies would therefore apply to the LSLA lands as they are located on vulnerable lands designated




Figure 23: Map of significant groundwater recharge areas. Study area delineated in yellow.




Figure 24: Map of Water Infiltration Classifications. Study area delineated in yellow.




Figure 25: Map of Key Natural Heritage Areas. Study area delineated in orange.

as Highly Vulnerable Aquifer and, Significant Groundwater Recharge Area.

Natural Heritage Areas

The Richmond Hill Official Plan, York Region Official Plan, and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (“ORMCP”) all identify Key Natural Heritage Areas as:

- Wetlands

- Significant portions of the habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species
- Fish habitat
- Significant valleylands
- Significant woodlands
- Significant wildlife habitat
- Sand Barrens, savannahs, and Tallgrass Prairies

The Richmond Hill Official Plan identifies wetlands

and significant woodlands within the LSLA subject lands as shown in **Figure 25**.

According to section 22 of the ORMCP, development and site alteration is prohibited within lands within Key Natural Heritage Areas. Wetlands, as defined by the ORMCP are lands such as a swamp, marsh, bog or fen that is seasonally or permanently covered by shallow water; has hydric soils and vegetation dominated by hydrophytic or water tolerant plants; and has been identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources as a wetland. The ORMCP identifies significant woodlands according to the definitions established by the Ministry of Natural Resources, which are woodlands that have a tree crown cover of over 60% of the ground or a tree crown cover of over 10% of the ground with on ground stem estimates of:

- a. 1,000 trees of any size per hectare, or
- b. 750 trees measuring over five centimetres in diameter, per hectare, or
- c. 500 trees measuring over 12 centimetres in diameter, per hectare, or
- d. 250 trees measuring over 20 centimetres in diameter, per hectare

(Forestry Act 1(1))

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90f26>

Section 3.2.1.2 (8) of the Richmond Hill Official Plan states that there must be a minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres from the outer limits of all Key Natural Heritage Areas, except for Significant Woodlands Areas and Significant Habitats of endangered and threatened species. As shown in **Figure 25**, some Significant Woodland

Areas are within the study area, and therefore will require site specific study to determine or verify the significance of the woodlands, and the minimum vegetation protection zone, which in no case shall be less than 10 metres, as stated in section 3.2.1.2 (25) of the Richmond Hill Official Plan.

As covered in section 3.3 of this report, the majority of the LSLA lands are located within Countryside Areas, however some portions are also located within Natural Linkage Areas, and are subject to strict policies that prohibit development, as stated in section 12 of the ORMCP. Figure 4 (report section 3.3) shows a map of the land uses as identified by the ORMCP. The purpose of Natural Linkage Areas is to maintain and where possible, improve and restore the ecological integrity of the Plan area and the regional-scale open space linkages between Natural Core Areas and along River Valleys and Stream Corridors.

These policies therefore must be considered when discussing the lands within the LSLA boundary. For these reasons, a comprehensive land use and environmental study should be undertaken by the Region, as the lands are no longer suitable for farming due to the constraints of existing development.

6.0 Economic Factors

6.1 Employment Forecast

The purpose of this section is to present employment forecasts to the year 2041 based on the 2011 background information used to prepare the forecasts. The forecasts summarized in this report are based on 45% intensification for the York Region (Hemson Consulting Ltd, 2019).

Regional Context: Growth Plan

Policy direction in the Growth Plan, aims to align land use planning with economic development goals and strategies to retain and attract investment

and employment. The Growth Plan forecasts York Region to grow to 1.79 million people and 900,000 jobs by 2041 (Hemson Consulting Ltd, 2019).

York Region then allocates growth targets across the local municipalities between 2021 and 2041, as noted in the chart below.

Richmond Hill

The City of Richmond Hill is anticipated to continue to experience relatively strong employment growth with growth tapering off towards the end of the forecast due to a diminishing employment land supply. Major office development is expected to continue to grow in Richmond Hill Centre, the

York Region	2011	2031	2041	2051
Population	1,065,200	1,590,000	1,700,000	1,790,000
Employment	510,000	790,000	840,000	900,000

Source: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019

York Region Employment Forecast by Local Municipality

Municipality	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Aurora	21,900	28,500	31,600	33,600	35,500	37,000	38,500
East Gwillimbury	7,400	9,900	14,600	17,600	23,900	34,400	45,100
Georgina	7,700	9,700	12,500	14,500	17,400	20,900	24,500
King	8,200	9,500	11,200	12,200	13,000	14,200	16,000
Markham	154,800	178,100	200,500	217,500	233,700	252,000	269,200
Newmarket	42,800	43,400	45,900	47,700	49,400	50,800	52,400
Richmond Hill	69,300	79,600	88,000	94,000	99,600	104,600	109,800
Vaughan	185,100	221,000	250,000	267,600	286,400	303,800	321,500
Whitchurch-Stouffville	12,800	15,200	17,800	19,700	21,100	22,300	23,000
York Region	510,000	594,900	672,100	724,000	780,000	840,000	900,000

Source: York Region 2041 Preferred Growth Scenario 2041 Population and Employment Forecasts

Yonge Street corridor, and business parks along the Highway 404 Corridor. Overall, Richmond Hill's employment base is forecast to grow by approximately 40,500 jobs from 2011 to 2041 (Employment Survey Result Richmond Hill 2018).

Whitchurch-Stouffville

Most of the employment growth in the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville will be located in the community of Stouffville. Approximately 23,000 jobs are anticipated by 2041, which represents an annual growth rate of about 2 percent. The majority (82%) of the growth is anticipated to occur by 2031 (York Region 2041 Preferred Growth Scenario 2041 Population and Employment Forecasts, n.d.). According to the 404 Corridor Report, the area along the east side of the 404 is a significant employment area because of its location in proximity to key interchanges, and is able to accommodate "clean" industrial development on full municipal services (office and business park uses). The corridor also has the space for large contiguous parcels, including existing designated employment areas (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, 2019).

6.2 Potential Tax Base and Land Value Analysis

Through creating estimates for the potential property tax that could be generated for the municipality of Richmond Hill and the Regional Municipality of York, the development of the

study area has the potential to generate around \$25,000,000 to \$42,000,000 per year in property tax revenue. The estimated property tax revenue from a potential redevelopment of the site varies tremendously based on housing typology and the percentage of the site that is kept as open or undeveloped space. For example, a redevelopment of the site where 25 percent of the land is kept as open space such as road infrastructure and green spaces could generate around \$37,000,000 in property tax revenue, while a redevelopment with 20 percent of the site left as open space for parks and infrastructure could potentially generate \$42,000,000 in tax revenue. For more detailed estimates we have created four different development scenarios as seen in the tables below.

Methodology

Due to the large variation in potential options for the redevelopment of the site, several scenarios have been made in order to provide more accurate estimates. In order to create estimates of the potential tax base that will be added to the municipality of Richmond Hill and to York Region, several assumptions had to be made. Creating estimates for the potential property tax revenue is dependent on the potential number of units that could realistically be built within the site, the estimated property value for different typologies of housing and the estimated property tax rate for each potential property.

Through analyzing residential development densities across several modern communities within Canada, the assumption was made that a total of 23 single family detached homes, 42

Land Development Options	Total Hectares Developed on Site	Percentage of Total Site Coverage	Estimated Number of Units per Hectares	Estimated Total Numbers of Units	Estimated Property Value per Unit	Estimated Property Tax Revenue per Unit	Estimated Total Property Tax Revenue
Open Space/ Undeveloped	80.8	40%					
Mid-rise Condominiums	10.1	5%	125	1262.5	\$590,000.00	\$3853.00	\$4,864,412.50
Townhouses	40.4	20%	42	1696.8	\$770,000.00	\$5028.00	\$8,531,510.40
Single Family Detached	70.7	35%	23	1626.1	\$1,120,000.00	\$7314.00	11,893,295.40
Total	202	100%					\$25,289,218.30

Figure 26 A: Scenario 1: 35 Percent Single Detached, 20 Percent Townhouses, 5 Percent Mid Rise Condominiums and 40 Percent Open Space

Land Development Options	Total Hectares Developed on Site	Percentage of Total Site Coverage	Estimated Number of Units per Hectares	Estimated Total Numbers of Units	Estimated Property Value per Unit	Estimated Property Tax Revenue per Unit	Estimated Total Property Tax Revenue
Open Space/ Undeveloped	60.6	30%					
Mid-rise Condominiums	20.2	10%	125	2525	\$590,000.00	\$3853.00	\$9,728,825.00
Townhouses	50.5	25%	42	2121	\$770,000.00	\$5028.00	\$10,664,388.00
Single Family Detached	70.7	35%	23	1626.1	\$1,120,000.00	\$7314.00	\$11,893,295.00
Total	202	100%					\$32,286,508.40

Figure 26 B: Scenario 2: 35 Percent Single Detached, 25 Percent Townhouses, 10 Percent Mid Rise Condominiums and 30 Percent Open Space

Land Development Options	Total Hectares Developed on Site	Percentage of Total Site Coverage	Estimated Number of Units per Hectares	Estimated Total Numbers of Units	Estimated Property Value per Unit	Estimated Property Tax Revenue per Unit	Estimated Total Property Tax Revenue
Open Space/ Undeveloped	50.5	25%					
Mid-rise Condominiums	30.3	15%	125	3787.5	\$590,000.00	\$3853.00	\$14,593,237.00
Townhouses	50.5	25%	42	2121	\$770,000.00	\$5028.00	\$10,664,388.00
Single Family Detached	70.7	35%	23	1626.1	\$1,120,000.00	\$7314.00	\$11,893,295.40
Total	540	100%					\$37,150,920.90

Figure 26 C: Scenario 3: 35 Percent Single Detached, 25 Percent Townhouses, 15 Percent Mid Rise Condominiums and 25 Percent Open Space

Land Development Options	Total Hectares Developed on Site	Percentage of Total Site Coverage	Estimated Number of Units per Hectares	Estimated Total Numbers of Units	Estimated Property Value per Unit	Estimated Property Tax Revenue per Unit	Estimated Total Property Tax Revenue
Open Space/ Undeveloped	40.4	20%					
Mid-rise Condominiums	40.4	20%	125	5050	\$590,000.00	\$3853.00	\$19,457,650.00
Townhouses	60.6	30%	42	2545.2	\$770,000.00	\$5028.00	\$12,797,265.60
Single Family Detached	60.6	30%	23	1393.8	\$1,120,000.00	\$7314.00	\$10,194,253.20
Total	540	100%					\$42,449,168.80

Figure 26 D: Scenario 3: 30 Percent Single Detached, 30 Percent Townhouses, 20 Percent Mid Rise Condominiums and 20 Percent Open Space

townhouses or 125 apartment units within mid rise buildings could be built per hectare excluding open space infrastructure such as main roads and parks (City of St Albert, 2018). Although neighbourhood densities vary dramatically due to variation in architecture and urban design styles, these assumptions attempt to provide a conservative estimate with developers potentially being able to increase and maximize the total units of each listed housing typology per hectare.

Each scenario as depicted in figures 26 A-D, makes a different assumption as to how the total 500 acres or around 202 hectares of the site could be developed through using different combinations of housing typology in order to estimate the total number of each typology of the unit. Once the total number of units has been assumed, average property values were estimated. The value of single family detached homes was estimated at \$1,120,000 each, townhouses were estimated to be worth \$770,000 each and condominium apartment units were estimated at being worth \$590,000 each based on York Region's average prices before COVID-19 (York Region, 2019c).

Through using the City of Richmond Hill's property tax calculator it was estimated that single family homes could generate \$7,314 each, townhouses could generate \$5,028 each and each condominium unit on average could generate \$3,853 in taxes (City of Richmond Hill, 2021b). It is important to note that the estimates for the property tax rate could vary from the actual rate that is charged due to a number of variables. After determining average property tax rates for each unit, it is then multiplied by the estimated total number of units

of that same household typology to calculate the total estimated potential tax revenue when added with the other total revenue estimates from each household typology.

6.3 Neighboring Employment Demographics: Whitchurch-Stouffville

The presence of the Gormley GO Station benefits neighbouring areas by providing regional transportation options, which encourages the development of accessible employment hubs. Whitchurch-Stouffville has been able to capitalize from the station, and begin to further establish their own economic corridor along Highway 404. The Gormley GO Station, in conjunction with other infrastructure investments, has accelerated urbanization throughout Whitchurch-Stouffville, creating further employment opportunities for residents, resulting in steady economic growth for the Town.

Whitchurch-Stouffville's labour force participation rate is higher than the Provincial average by over 5% (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, 2020). The town has a 65.7% employment rate, and 19% of the population work inside the Town itself. The majority of workers living in Whitchurch-Stouffville work predominantly outside the Town, throughout

parts of the GTA. Over half of the town's working population works in either Markham or Toronto (52%).

Since the mid-2010's, the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville has been consistently growing. Between 2014-2019 Whitchurch-Stouffville grew by almost 2,500 businesses, which account for a growth of 64% (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, 2020) Between 2014-2019, the most growth of occupation within Whitchurch-Stouffville's labour recruiting was computer information system managers (72% rise) information systems consultants and analysts (58% rise) as well as financial and investment analysts (53% rise). Whitchurch-Stouffville's labour recruiting area is based off of commute flows, identifying a probable labour recruitment area.

The Town identified information system analysts, programmers or interactive media developers, software developers, as well as data base engineers and data administrators as the most prominent growing industries. The following are projections of the occupations expected to have the largest and fastest job growth, as seen in figures 27 A and B.

Since the opening of the Gormley GO Station in 2016, Whitchurch-Stouffville has been growing significantly. The economic growth of Whitchurch-Stouffville is not the only thing that increased as a result of the Gormley GO Station. Within Gormley and the greater area there has been a rise in traffic congestion, limiting the viability of farming options within the subject lands. As settlements outside of the station begin to create economic opportunities, and Whitchurch-Stouffville begins further expanding their economic corridor, these acts will only further increase traffic congestion.

Description	2019 Jobs	2026 Jobs	2019 - 2016 Change
Information systems analysts and consultants	42,332	51,877	9,545
Computer programmers and interactive media developers	34,563	40,920	6,357
Computer and information systems managers	21,717	27,072	5,355
Financial auditors and accountants	38,577	43,737	5,160
Other financial officers	26,569	31,306	4,737
Financial and investment analysts	23,875	27,992	4,117
User support technicians	20,059	24,079	4,020
Administrative officers	36,652	40,315	3,663
Food and beverages servers	29,442	32,806	3,364
Professional occupations in advertising, marketing and public relations	22,804	25,938	3,134
Software engineers and designers	12,817	15,606	2,789
Program leaders and instructors in recreation, sport and fitness	18,421	21,122	2,701

Figure 27 A: Occupations with the Largest Projected Job Growth (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, 2020)

Description	2019 - 2016 Change	2019 - 2016% Change
Database analysts and data administrators	2,445	25%
Computer and information systems managers	5,355	25%
Information systems analysts and consultants	9,545	23%
Software engineers and designers	2,789	22%
User support technicians	4,020	20%
Supervisors, finance and insurance office workers	2,615	19%
Senior managers - financial, communications and other business services	2,449	19%
Computer programmers and interactive media developers	6,357	18%
Other financial officers	4,737	18%
Financial and Investment analysts	4,117	17%
Human resources professionals	2,690	16%
Program leaders and instructors in recreation, sport and fitness	2,701	15%

Figure 27 B: Occupations with the Fastest Projected Job Growth (Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, 2020)

7.0 Stakeholder Factors

7.1 Interview with Farmer, Paul Doner

An interview was conducted with a local farmer and owner of John Doner Limited, Paul Doner, who both owns property in the study area local to the Gormley community. These farming operations occur on both his own property and the properties of surrounding LSLA land owners, and have existed for over 200 years on this land and is the only remaining custom farmer in the area. The farming operations primarily produce corn and soybean cash crops using traditional machine based farming techniques which employ the use of large mobile equipment including tractors, trailers, combines, cultivators, and several others. It also includes the use of farm grade pesticides. The lands that are farmed require the farmer and farm staff to move this equipment between fields using the public roads. Notably, the Doner farm is the only food production farm in Richmond Hill.

Some of the primary concerns that were identified by Mr. Doner included economic and health related issues, which were shared by other landowners, politicians, and City staff. A notable

issue that was brought forward by many parties is the threat to public and worker safety presented by the movement of heavy equipment for farming between properties. Paul Doner noted other farmers in areas of the GTA that have experienced several traffic accidents a year and suffered injury while moving equipment. The danger posed by local roads, narrowed by curbs, reduced shoulders, and guardrails through urbanization have created situations where wide farm equipment by necessity travels at least partially in the oncoming traffic lane.

“Road size is an issue for us... moving machinery in this kind of traffic in urban areas is increasingly difficult [and] safety is a concern for us... in some situations we are making a turn in our equipment on a blind hill and trying not to get killed, or end up killing somebody else.”

~ Paul Doner, Personal Communication March 4th, 2021

Most interviewees including the farmer, landowners and one of the two politicians could agree that the viability of farming operations was impacted by the intensification of nearby properties to a degree that traditional farming operations have become dangerous and inefficient, and that perhaps there were more suitable uses for the land that did not conflict with surrounding uses. While some parties suggested a change in the type of agriculture, Mr. Doner was able to note the technical and

economic challenges involved with changing crop or operation conditions and type, including retooling. He also noted that simply changing the type of agriculture does not necessarily improve the personal safety and financial risks associated with the farming of the land. Mr. Doner pointed out that there is already significant infrastructure in place regarding servicing and transportation, which has the potential to support additional growth in the area.

An additional concern raised by Mr. Doner was the issue of the economic viability of agricultural operations. The land value of the farmed land is increasing and is already well beyond both profitability and financial ability of young farmers. Doner notes that the mortgage and finance cost of the land would be too high for any farm operation given the current value of cash crops for a new farmer to purchase, and farm the land in any way that would garner a profit. He acknowledged that the political optics of development in the Greenbelt may appear risky, but that discussions in the past regarding the area and conservation authorities had revealed that development in Countryside Areas was both not identified as a major area of concern, and that any attempt to redesignate the land to be incorporated into the Settlement Area should happen in concert with conservation authorities and other development stakeholders to ensure a positive and sustainable plan regarding the future of the land.

7.2 Interviews with City Staff

For the purposes of creating an unbiased study of the land and all relevant stakeholders, several notable representatives for both the City of Richmond Hill and York Region were contacted in addition to the farmers and local landowners. These Staff members include: the Chief Planner of York Region; the Director of Long Range Planning for York Region; and the Director of Policy Planning in Richmond Hill. Each provided a concise perspective from both the upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities involved with the LSLA lands. The staff who responded were subsequently interviewed about their knowledge, opinions and involvement in the current processes on the lands, though several contacts either did not respond in time for the completion of this report, or declined to comment due to other issues or complications.

Generally, both York Region and Richmond Hill staff were knowledgeable about the current situation involving the LSLA lands. The Region acknowledged that the lands' location within the boundaries of the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt areas has been the subject of politically-charged debates regarding development within the Plan areas since 2001. Due to being located within their jurisdiction, Richmond Hill staff were also well-acquainted with the LSLA farmers and aware of the challenges presented, though they were not as familiar

with the condition of the farms themselves. York Region Staff believe that the current designation is appropriate, consistent with Regional reports, stating that expansion to the lands is not required for at least another 20-30 to accommodate growth. Similarly, the staff of both cities agree on the anomaly presented by the infrastructure of the GO station, which further complicates matters of development within the nearby vicinity. Furthermore, the public's perception of potential erosion within the Greenbelt and ORMCP areas that would be caused by development is another concern shared by both levels of city staff.

While it appears that many of the viewpoints are shared by the staff at both Richmond Hill and the Region, there were several notable distinctions between the two. Because the local Council passed a direction to staff to investigate the lands for development, the Director's position is required to support the wishes of Council. In contrast, the York Region Staff discussed the implications of the LSLA lands in a more regional context, citing issues between the wishes of government bodies and maintaining public interest. Ultimately, both levels of staff have cited the Province as being the key factor in deciding the next course of action for the LSLA lands and other lands similar to them.

7.3 Interviews with Landowners

The contacted landowners consisted of property developers and owners who were interviewed for

their viewpoints on the proposed redesignation and the future implications for their properties. The properties were typically located within 1 kilometre of the Gormley GO Station, with most of the landowners being neighbours or otherwise well-acquainted with Paul Doner, one of the last custom farmers in the area.

A significant portion of the landowners noted that their families acquired their properties prior to the development of Highway 404. Many are also aware of the challenges and dangers faced by Paul Doner during his farming initiatives and share his frustration regarding his inability to work, citing road safety concerns caused by insufficient road width, as well as the presence of commuter traffic on arterial roads. Each of the interviewed landowners agreed that redesignation is required on the lands, as they believe maintaining agricultural protections is illogical over the long-term given the impacts of surrounding urbanisation. One landowner noted that a potential Settlement Area designation feels like "the natural next step," being that the lands are within walking distance of the GO station.

The landowners believe the most significant impact upon the public's opinion regarding potential redesignation is the perception of development "eroding the Greenbelt," and the miscommunication of the government's interests. One landowner emphasized their opinion that the public does not read through legal acts in full, and questioned why the ORMCP lands are restricted to agency use instead of for public uses, as legal documents suggest.

Notably, another landowner believes that all limitations currently affecting the lands are political in nature, citing the disagreements between Greenbelt advocates, the various government bodies, and the presence of “not-in-my-backyard” viewpoints in the area.

Topfar Developments, a firm working on behalf of one of the landowners, believes that the public needs to be further educated on what the Greenbelt designation really means. They noted in an interview that they are “adding to the Greenbelt rather than removing lands from it,” which tends to be a source of confusion by residents. Furthermore, they are aware of the possible inflation of land values, believing that developments in the area need to offer the developers a way of making money, while still being able to benefit the public. In conclusion, both the landowners and property developers alike are frustrated with the current complications associated with the LSLA lands, specifically due to the confusion between intergovernmental relations, and the general level of communication with the public. Similar to the views of Paul Doner, a farmer in the area, the landowners’ overall opinions on the potential redesignation were quite similar amongst each other, being supportive of the Client’s proposal. They agree that the redesignation would be a positive change, allowing for new land uses instead of keeping the lands in their current condition, while still maintaining the integrity of Natural Core and Natural Linkage Areas.

7.4 Interviews with Politicians

To address the political side of this issue, several political figures were contacted for an opportunity to interview. Many did not respond during the creation of this report and others responded noting that they did not wish to be interviewed. The only political figure who contacted the research group to participate in an interview or otherwise provide information was Richmond Hill City Councillor Tom Muench. It is important to note that Councillor Muench is not the representative of the Ward that contains the LSLA lands.

Councillor Muench noted that he was aware of the LSLA lands and the interest in the redesignation from Countryside to Settlement Area. It was his understanding that agricultural operations have significantly and dramatically been reduced in size and scope in Richmond Hill over the last 20 years, and that the agricultural operation remaining has become logistically difficult. He reflected many of the same sentiments of LSLA landowners and the farmer of discussion, Paul Doner. Notable concerns were the ongoing safety and road use issue, as well as the adversely impacted economics of farming in the area that has been caused by new developments and incompatible land uses. He also repeated ideas that several parties mentioned regarding concern for the Greenbelt and nearby Oak Ridges Moraine Lands, but made effort to recognize that it is only the Countryside lands seeking redesignation and that the more sensitive Natural Linkage Areas and

Natural Core Areas would be conserved.

While it is helpful to have the contribution to the study by Councillor Muench, it is unfortunate that more political figures were unable to respond as it is difficult to establish a pattern from a sample of one. To more reliably analyze the political stakeholders viewpoint, it would be necessary to include more interviewees from various levels of government that were willing to participate in the research. By councillor Muench being the only political stakeholder to participate in the research, it could lead to an erroneous conclusion of political support for redesignation as the research team has not been made aware of any opposing views from this group.

7.5 Interviews with TRCA

The research team was able to hold an interview with Quentin Hanchard of the TRCA. Although the team also reached out to several other environmental groups, all others either refused to participate in an interview, and in the case of one did not respond during the production time of this report to book an interview.

Speaking on behalf of the TRCA, Quentin made note that they were aware of the lands and of the landowners, as well as the intent of the landowners in seeking review of the lands for inclusion in the Settlement Area. He made note that the Oak Ridges Moraine is the “water barrel” for the Greater Toronto Area as it is a headwaters for southern watersheds. There is a concern then that there is a complex environmental consideration to be made

and it is not simply changing the designation from Agriculture to Settlement Area.

“Because there is significant infiltration, when you change the land use, you fundamentally change what happens to the water when it hits the ground.”

- Quentin Hanchard, Personal Communication, March 2021.

It is the opinion of the TRCA that the Countryside designation plays a significant role in the system under the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The Countryside area provides a natural buffer between more environmentally sensitive areas and the Natural Core and Natural Linkage areas. Countryside areas that are currently designated in the system help to facilitate East/West linkages which Quentin described as critical for the function of the system as a whole. From an environmental perspective, Quentin noted that it would not be positive to change the land to more urban uses.

Quentin agreed with many landowners that there has been an impact on the area study area is still viable for agricultural use or not. The land becoming more difficult to farm does not necessarily mean that the land is not longer viable, and the TRCA sees the land as supportive for agricultural related use, including functions such as agro-tourism, etc. It was also noted that the land should be considered through a comprehensive process to evaluate the implications on the land, but also all of the surrounding land, and vice versa. Current and future construction should be considered to protect against incompatible land uses.

Wider Context (Richmond Hill & Beyond)



Social Factors

Health and Safety

Housing and Affordable Housing

Inclusionary Zoning Policies

8.0 Social Factors

8.1 Health and Safety

When considering the overall health and safety outcomes within this area, an important factor to be considered is the impact on farming operations due to the increased traffic. Technical aspects, such as the width of several adjacent right-of-ways, the addition of guardrails, curbs, signs, and hydro poles have been implemented to accommodate urbanisation. The result of this urban infrastructure is that large farm equipment can not safely move between fields.

This poses a significant safety risk to the farm equipment operators and the general public. These concerns were expressed directly the primary farmer in the area - Paul Doner - and are of significant importance as they affect human health and safety-- a primary concern of many Provincial acts. The safety impact of the continued agricultural designation on the lands is important to consider when making any potential changes or proposals.

The potential loss of the agricultural lands would not negatively impact the local population's access to fresh foods, as the yields from the LSLA farmlands are primarily shipped for export. According to the farmers, this diversion from the local food supply is done in order to recoup financial losses incurred from the efficiency disruptions of sur-

rounding developments.

8.2 Housing and Affordable Housing

Affordable Housing and Housing in York Region

Richmond Hill currently has the highest proportion of owners and tenants in the Region that are experiencing the issues of affordability within York Region, which further drives the need for more affordable housing in Richmond Hill, as well as York Region (Richmond Hill, 2021). Both York Region and the City of Richmond Hill have policies and plans in place to address the issue of affordable housing, as well as housing in general.

York Region has been monitoring the construction of new affordable housing throughout each municipality in the Region, and has a set threshold for what is considered affordable. As of 2018, York Region has fallen behind considerably in encouraging new affordable housing compared to previous years. In 2016, the percentage of new housing that was below the Region's affordable housing threshold was 46%, while in 2018 the percentage was 12% (York Region, 2019b) . There is a decrease in the proportion of new housing construction year over year that is considered "affordable" by York

Region.

York Region plans and reports indicate that the Region has significant work to do in order to reach its stated affordable housing goals. If developers are able to develop the farmlands located around the Gormley GO Station, York Region could use the land as an opportunity require new affordable units in proximity to a major transit station, and contribute to the Region's housing goals.

Richmond Hill's Policies on Affordable Housing

The City's Official Plan provides policies related to affordable housing. Section 3.1.5 (2) states that within key development areas, a minimum of 35% of new housing units must be affordable. Section 3.1.5 (3) notes that within the settlement area of the town a minimum of 25% of new housing units must be affordable. These two sections set the framework for how the City intends to address the affordable housing crisis within Richmond Hill. Richmond Hill's Affordable Housing Strategy sets the goals and objectives for affordable units by providing information on what developers should do to help create more affordable housing units in future developments (Richmond Hill, 2021).

Richmond Hill intends to amend its Official Plan and Zoning By-law to allow for the construction of additional residential units for ground-related dwellings such as garden suites (Richmond Hill, 2021). This allows for a higher density of affordable housing in areas that may contribute to the overall affordable stock. The farmland located within the

study boundaries provides the opportunity for the City of Richmond Hill's guidelines stated within the Affordable Housing Strategy to be used for new developments, creating more affordable housing.

8.3 Inclusionary Zoning Policies

Inclusionary Zoning ("IZ") is a municipal tool provided by s. 16(5) of the Planning Act in order to address the issue of housing affordability which came into force in April 2018. Such policies have yet to be properly established within the City of Richmond Hill.

However, the City is currently in the process of considering the use of these inclusionary zoning policies within certain locations that are designated Protected Major Transit Station Areas ("PMT-SAs") by York Region. Specifically, they have completed a needs assessment in accordance with the region's inclusionary zoning regulations, which they have detailed further within their Affordable Housing Strategy (City of Richmond Hill, 2021). It is expected that City Staff will work to implement inclusionary zoning tools by updating Official Plan policies and adopting new inclusionary zoning by-laws once the Council has properly evaluated and endorsed the proposed strategy.

As it is up to the Region to deem areas as PMTSAs, York Regional Council has already begun the proposition of implementing IZ policies during several meetings in 2018. The Region's Chief Planner and Commissioner of Corporate Services recommended Council to request that the Province revisit the IZ guidelines and revise them in collaboration with municipalities in the Region (York Regional Council, 2018).

As of September 2020, York Regional Council has proposed delineations for the boundaries of potential MTSA areas throughout the Region. Though the site of the Gormley GO Station is proposed to be designated, it will not be considered to be a PMTSA, meaning that any IZ policies implemented by the City of Richmond Hill would not apply to the area upon adoption of the new Official Plan. However, there remains a potential for Gormley GO to be designated a PMTSA in the long-term, in which case, IZ policies could be applied in the future.

According to item H.2.1 from the York Region Council meeting in September 2020, Council adopted several of the aforementioned recommendations as amended. Among the recommendations included the endorsement of the MTSA boundary delineations within the Regional Official Plan update, as well as the consideration of a minimum density target of 150 residents and jobs per hectare for the Gormley GO station area. In the context of the LSLA lands surrounding the station, the implementation of IZ policies in the surrounding areas would be highly dependent on how the Region approaches these density targets in the future.

8.4 Low Impact Design

Areas such as the LSLA lands, which have environmental considerations, present an opportunity to use the lands as an example to develop and implement a higher level of construction and development standards for areas with similar hydrological conditions. New low impact strategies include permeable pavers, native plantings and bioretention strategies to mitigate urban runoff (WBDG, 2020) that can be applied at the site and neighbourhood scale. Improved erosion protection both during construction and after could also be used to address environmental concerns.

Passive house building standards, especially those that prioritize low carbon (Fourth Pig, 2016) materials, could improve energy efficiency, reduce off-gassing and pollutant run-off from building materials during construction and in operation. As a combined new standard, these enhanced environmental development strategies could be used to create highly efficient low-impact developments that have the potential to change how land is used and neighbourhoods are built in environmentally sensitive areas. Application of new performance standards based in this kind of low impact development to future expansions of the Settlement Area could create more sustainable and resilient neighbourhoods for the long-term, and relieve environmental impacts in sensitive areas, like in other parts of the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt areas.

Conclusions



Conclusions

Recommendations

Conclusions

In undertaking this study, two main questions were considered by Project Team: Whether the subject lands are still viable for agricultural uses from a physical and social and economic perspective, and whether there is a policy framework for redesignation.

Through analysis, the Project Team has concluded that there is a policy framework well-established to allow for the ORMCP Countryside Area to be redesignated to a Settlement Area. Regarding viability, the Team has concluded that changes to the land use of the surrounding area has made a notable impact on the logistics, economics, and safety of the farming operations on the agricultural lands. With this in mind, the Team has determined that the current farming practices are not viable on the lands in the context of surrounding developments and existing infrastructure.

As a result, the Project Team believes that the request to study the lands for potential urbanisation through their inclusion in the Settlement Area is justified, and a comprehensive study should be conducted by the municipalities to determine the most appropriate use for the land given the incompatibility of the surrounding context. Notwithstanding the recently-completed Land Needs Assessment completed by York Region, it is clear that the incompatibility of the surrounding land uses needs to be addressed, either through mitigating actions or policy.

9.0 Recommendations

Based on our conclusions, the Team has assembled a list of short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations for the Client to pursue in consultation with local planning authorities. In the view of the Project Team, any potential redesignation of the lands is likely to be a matter of “when” rather than “if” when considered over a long-term horizon.

Recommendations to the Region

1

Short-term (0-2 years)

As part of the ongoing MCR, carry out a comprehensive study of the subject lands to determine the viability of continued agricultural land use designations of the LSLA lands, given the impacts of surrounding urban development and erosion of contiguous farm lots.

2

Medium-term (3-5 years)

Proactively identify areas with similar potential land use conflicts to ensure long-term compatibility between the agricultural land base and investment patterns in the Region

Recommendations to the City of Richmond Hill

1

Short-term (0-2 years)

Implement more active mitigation and traffic control techniques to:

- Reduce safety risks for mixed traffic conditions and
- Enable existing the use to continue in its urban context with minimized disruption, until the farmers cease operations

Create a working group comprised of both landowners and staff to respond to agricultural concerns, and maintain an open dialogue with agricultural stakeholders in the municipality.

As part of the ongoing MCR, carry out a comprehensive study of the subject lands to determine the viability of continued agricultural land use designations of the LSLA lands.

2

Medium-term (3-5 years)

If the LSLA lands are redesignated to permit development:

Continue to plan for and implement infrastructure improvements to accommodate existing and future capacity issues (roadways, utility servicing, etc.)

If the current LSLA land use designations remain in place:

Invest in infrastructure improvements, such as street widenings, to enable regular agricultural operations to become feasible without excessive traffic control.

3

LONG TERM FOR BOTH REGION AND LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

1) Plan for the long-term utilisation of the subject lands to accommodate future growth in the Region.

2) Use the lands as an opportunity to improve performance standards in ecologically-sensitive areas which can be applied across the City and Region.

Recommendations to the LSLA

1

Short-term (0-2 years)

Continue to pursue a comprehensive land use study of the LSLA lands by the Region as part of the ongoing MCR.

Remain engaged in the City's and Region's MCR process, and participate if/when a Secondary Plan process is launched.

2

Medium-term (3-5 years)

If the LSLA lands are not redesignated as part of the current MCR process:

Investigate other alternative as-of-right agricultural uses to adapt to the disruption caused by neighbouring development (i.e., viable crops that do not require large machinery, agri-tourism uses, etc.)

References

- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. (1998). The Canadian System of Soil Classification 3rd edition. Ottawa: National Research Council of Canada. Retrieved from <https://sis.agr.gc.ca/cansis/taxa/cssc3/LU/index.html>
- ARDA, 1965, Canada Land Inventory, Soil Capability Classification for Agriculture. Report No. 2. Dept . of Forestry and Rural Development.
- City of St Albert (2018). Residential Density Handbook. Retrieved from https://stalbert.ca/site/assets/files/3264/pd_residential-density-handbook.pdf
- City of Richmond Hill (2021a). Affordable Housing Strategy. Retrieved from <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/find-or-learn-about/affordable-housing-strategy.aspx>
- City of Richmond Hill (2021b) Residential Property Tax Calculator. Retrieved from <https://eservices.richmondhill.ca/taxcalculator/>
- Employment Survey Result Richmond Hill (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/2019-Socio-Economic-Study.pdf>
- GO Transit (2020). Richmond Hill Go Train and Bus Schedule. Retrieved from https://www.gotransit.com/static_files/gotransit/assets/pdf/TripPlanning/FullSchedules/FS05092020/Table61.pdf
- Hemson Consulting Ltd (2019). York Region Future Employment Trends Study. Retrieved from https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/ee026624-6ed6-4734-9793-2986bf53e945/YORK-%239447893-v2-FINAL_York_Region_Future_Employment_Trends_Study_Report_May2019_AODA.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&C
- Metrolinx (2019). Ridership Performance Year-To-Date. Retrieved from <https://metrolinx.files.wordpress.com/2020/02/click-here-to-see-the-above-ridership-map-in-detail.pdf>
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs. (2021). Classifying Prime and Marginal Agricultural Soils and Landscapes: Guidelines for Application of the Canada Land Inventory in Ontario. Retrieved from <http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/landuse/classify.htm>
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs. (2021). Prime Agricultural Areas. Retrieved from <http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/landuse/prime-ag-areas.htm#4>

Regional Municipality of York (2019a). Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Addendum. Retrieved from

<https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/49c9e75c-dc7e-4f2a-a562-1d348d0df998/Leslie+Street+Addendum+FINAL+Nov+18+AODA+Part+1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=mWe25l->

Regional Municipality of York (2019b) Housing Matters: A Review of the Housing Market in York Region. Retrieved from https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/dbbd22a6-b4ed-4513-b60f-71993717843d/20036_HousingMattersUpdate_March162020.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=n3ALSMq

Richmond Hill (2021). The City of Richmond Hill | Affordable Housing Strategy.

Retrieved from

<https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/Affordable-Housing-Strategy-Background-Report.pdf>

Richmond Hill (2018). Richmond Hill 2019 Socio-Economic Study. Retrieved from

<https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/shared-content/resources/documents/2019-Socio-Economic-Study.pdf>

The Centre for Spatial Economics and Environics Analytics (2020). 2020 Total

Population Estimates. Retrieved from <https://app-simplyanalytics-com.ezproxy.lib.ryerson.ca>

Transportation Tomorrow Survey (2016). Retrieved from

http://www.dmg.utoronto.ca/pdf/tts/2016/2016TTS_Summaries_TTSarea.pdf

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (2021). The Living City Policies. Retrieved from

<https://trca.ca/planning-permits/living-city-policies/>

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. (2013). Rouge River Report Card. Toronto: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. (n.d.). Hydrology. Retrieved from Toronto and Region Conservation

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. (2007). Rouge River Watershed Plan .

Toronto. Retrieved from Toronto and Region Conservation.

<https://trca.ca/conservation/environmental-monitoring/hydrology/>

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville. (2020). 2021 / 2022 Draft Operating & Capital Budget.

Retrieved from <https://www.townofws.ca/en/town-hall/resources/Documents/Draft-Operational-and-Capital-Budget-v3-Final---Reduced.pdf>

Ontario (2019). Data Catalogue. Retrieved from

<https://data.ontario.ca/en/dataset/transportation-tomorrow-historical-survey-data>

Ontario. (2017). Oak Ridges moraine conservation plan . Toronto, ON: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Ontario (2009). Forestry Act, R.S.O. 1990,c. F.26 Section 1(1). Retrieved from <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90f26>

Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2016). Provincial Highways. Retrieved from <https://www.library.mto.gov.on.ca/SydneyPLUS/TechPubs/Theme.aspx?r=702797&f=files%2fProvincial+Highways+traffic+Volumes+1988-2016.pdf&m=resource>

Province of Ontario. (n.d.). Water Resources. Province of Ontario.

York Region Council (2018). Council Minutes. Retrieved from <https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/f4805e6b-9b48-49ca-a97b-10c11b4e83e4/jan+25+proposed.pdf?MOD=AJPERES>

York Region (2021). York Region Regional Map. Retrieved from <https://yorkpublishing.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=20346>

York Region (2020a) Leslie Street EA. Retrieved from: <https://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/roads/roadconstructionschedule/lesliestreetea>

York Region (2020b). Frequent Transit Network (FTN) in 2025. Retrieved from <https://view.publitas.com/york-region-transportation-services/2020-transit-initiatives/page/12-13>

York Region (2019a) Departmental Budgets, Transit Services. Retrieved from <https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/d822b2cc-71c7-4cc8-995c-3133c8d547ad/2019+York+Region+Approved+Budget+Book+w+AODA+1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=mLVOGer>

York Region (2019b). Measuring and Monitoring 2018 Housing Affordability in York Region. Retrieved from <https://yorkpublishing.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=6941>

York Region (2017). Stouffville Road “Schedule C” Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. Retrieved from https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/2aca913f-6c10-4bdc-9adc-c4e8b95d0ff1/01_Stouffville+Rd+Schedule+C+Mun+CEA_ESR_Exec+Summary.pdf?MOD=AJPERES

York Region (2016) The Regional Municipality of York: Water and Wastewater Master Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/9602fc09-22ec-4202-8ce6-f2287a7b1aee/York+Region+Water+and+Wastewater+Master+Plan+2016pdf.pdf?MOD=AJPERES>

York Region (2015). Transportation Fact Book. Retrieved from
<https://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/yorkregion/yr/statisticsanddata/>

Appendices

Appendix A



Appendix A: Screen captured from the 2013 TRCA Rouge River Watershed Report Card, as referenced in 5.2 Environmental Analysis, Hydrological conditions.

Appendix B

RE: Richmond Hill Inclusionary Zoning Policies [Inbox x](#)



Sybelle von Kursell <sybelle.vonkursell@richmondhill.ca>

Thu, Mar 25, 11:03 AM (7 days ago)



to me, CAO

Hello Benjamin,

Further to your inquiry regarding the use of Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) within the City of Richmond Hill, please note that the City is presently considering the use of this new Planning Act tool within areas of Richmond Hill where the Region of York deems them to be Protected Major Transit Station Areas. To that end, the City has completed a needs assessment in accordance with the Inclusionary Zoning regulation. This is provided in our Affordable Housing Strategy Background Report which is available on the City's website at: [The City of Richmond Hill Affordable Housing Strategy](#). The City's Affordable Housing Strategy work will be considering IZ along with many other tools that may be appropriate to use in Richmond Hill, to better facilitate the development of affordable housing. Once Council has endorsed this forthcoming strategy, City staff will work to prepare the implementing tools, which may include updating Official Plan policy to enable the use of IZ and ultimately adopting an IZ by-law.

To learn more about the Affordable Housing Strategy, please see: [Affordable Housing Strategy - City of Richmond Hill](#)
 To learn more about the update to the City's Official Plan, please see: [Official Plan Update - City of Richmond Hill](#)

Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sybelle

Sybelle von Kursell, MCI, RPP
 Manager, Planning Policy
 Planning & Infrastructure Department
 Town of Richmond Hill
 225 East Beaver Creek Road
 Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4
 T: 905-771-2472 (direct line)
 F: 905-771-2404




Appendix B: Screen captured from an email from Sybelle von Kursell, as referenced in 8.3 Inclusionary zoning policies.

YORK REGION REGIONAL MAP

Landowner/Municipal Requests for Urban Expansion

 Urban Expansion Request

Land Use Category

 Built-up Area

 Designated Greenfield Area

 Greenbelt

 Hamlet

 2010 Urban Expansion

 Designated Greenfield Area - Agriculture

Base Map

 Municipal Boundary


 Other Municipal Boundaries

 Roads

 400-Series Highways

 Waterbodies

*Areas are draft and are awaiting approval through the Municipal Comprehensive Review and are subject to change.



Produced by:
The Regional Municipality of York
Planning and Economic
Development, Corporate Services
March 2021

Data: © Queen's Printer for Ontario
2003-2021



**York Region Official Plan Review
Landowner and Municipal Submissions for Urban Expansion for the Municipal Comprehensive Review**

Table 1: Landowner Requests

Note: Any lands ultimately identified for urban expansion would be subject to further studies to determine the extent of developable area.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
1	RJ Forhan & Associates	Romandale Farms Ltd.	4044 Elgin Mills Road East, Markham	Request for lands to be brought into the Urban Area through the MCR, should the Region determine a need for additional 'Whitebelt' land.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
2	Weston Consulting	1606620 Ontario Inc.	12700 7th Concession, King	The portion of the lands in Vaughan currently designated 'Whitebelt' maintain the designation and this portion of the property be added to the Urban Area should the Region determine a need for additional 'Whitebelt' land.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
3	Weston Consulting	Mrs. Orah Buck	5511 King Vaughan Road, Vaughan	The portion of the lands in Vaughan currently designated 'Whitebelt' maintain the designation and this portion of the property be added to the Urban Area should the Region determine a need for additional 'Whitebelt' land.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
4	Cam Milani	Milani Group	1136 Teston Road, Vaughan	Remove lands from ORMCP Countryside and Natural Linkage and bring them into the Settlement Area. Consider property for inclusion in the Urban Area should the Region determine a need for additional 'Whitebelt' land.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
5	IBI Group	Toromont Industries Limited	3230 King Road, King	Remove lands from Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System designations in Greenbelt Plan and remove lands from Greenbelt and Agricultural designations in YROP and re-designate land for Employment Use.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
6	M.A.M Group Inc (including subsidiary Trinistar Corporation) and SGL	Westlin Farms Incline Home Corporation, Trinison Management Corp., Trinistar Corporation	12470 Weston Road, King	Include the subject lands within the urban area expansion.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
7	Sorensen Gravely Lowes Planning & Design Inc.	Willowgrove	11737 McCowan Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Request that the Willowgrove lands not be considered for any "land swap" to redesignate the lands from 'Whitebelt' to greenbelt in the Greenbelt Plan. Request that this portion of the "Whitebelt lands" should remain as such to allow for the possibility of a logical urban boundary expansion of the Community of Stouffville, to accommodate Provincial growth projections.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
8	Evans Planning Inc.	Ms. Asha Rani Batra	1775 Bethesda Road, 12471 Leslie Street, 1700 Stouffville Road, Richmond Hill	Remove lands from the Greenbelt Plan and modify ORMCP designation to permit employment uses. Consider adding these lands to Urban Area through the MCR and redesignate to permit employment uses.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
9	Weston Consulting	Vinnie Ussia, 1116941 Ontario Ltd.	11180 Huntington Road, 6901 Kirby Road, 7001 Kirby Road, and 7055 Kirby Road, Vaughan	Include subject lands in the Urban Area through the MCR to permit low-rise residential use on the east side and commercial/industrial uses to the west of the railway tracks.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
10	Patrick Cheng	Peoples Gospel Church	5172 Major Mackenzie Drive East, Markham	Include subject lands in Urban Area through the MCR to permit construction of the Peoples Gospel Church.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
11	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	K & K Holdings Ltd.	11600 Keele Street, Vaughan	Include subject lands in urban area to align ROP with Vaughan OMB approved Official Plan.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
12	Michael Smith Planning Consultants Approved	1334618 Ontario Inc.	18823 Old Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Request to include subject lands (part of the 'Whitebelt') in the Urban Area through the MCR to permit low-density development of the lands.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
13	Barbir and Associates	18823 Old Yonge Street	12820 Bathurst Street, King	Include subject lands in the Township of King settlement area.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
14	Pamela Tang and Peter Chang Sing	Pamela Tang and Peter Chang Sing	11871 Albion Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Redesignate Greenbelt portion of the lands and bring entire property from 'Whitebelt' into Urban Area. Introduce a new GO station on property.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
15	Dillon Consulting	Mr. Edmund Moss	12441 Woodbine Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Request for an expansion of the Gormley Secondary Plan Area to include the subject lands to be developed as General Commercial and Light Employment.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
16	Bousfields Inc.	Living Life (Greenwich Inc.)	18618 Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Request for lands to be brought into the Urban Boundary for East Gwillimbury to permit the development of commercial and residential uses, including affordable, rental and seniors housing.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
17	Bousfields Inc.	Ms. Lesa Cozzi	1070 Nashville Road, Vaughan	Request for Whitebelt lands to be brought into the Urban Boundary through the MCR.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
18	Davies Howe Partners LLP	Warden North GP Inc.	11691 Warden Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
19	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	1453941 Ontario Ltd.	4995-5015 Lloydtown/ Aurora Road and 16425 8th Concession, King	Request for lands to be brought into Pottageville Hamlet Plan boundary through the MCR. Property is currently designated as Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System in the Greenbelt Plan.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
20	MMM Group Ltd.	Nizza Enterprises	2354 Ravenshoe Road, Georgina	Request the subject lands and the lands to the north be included into the Urban Area as well as re-designate the lands from Agricultural Protection Area to Employment as part of the Town's Official Plan review.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
21	Owners of the Bradford Inn (Sia and Frank)	Owners of the Bradford Inn (Sia and Frank)	20590 Highway 11, King	Request for additional permissions under the Greenbelt Plan to permit the development of a seniors housing complex or an expansion to the existing hotel use.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
22	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Block 42 landowners: Melrose Properties Inc., Ironrose Investments Inc., MCN (Pinevalley) Inc., Mel-Terra Investments Inc., Azure Woods Home Corp., Lazio Farms Holdings Inc., Mastro Capital Partners Inc., Mastro Investments Inc., and Intu Developments Corporation	12011 Pine Valley Drive, Vaughan	Request for an expansion of the urban boundary to include the lands within Block 42 for urban uses through the MCR.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
23	Biddington Homes/Bousfields Inc.	Owners of 198 Oriole Drive, East Gwillimbury	198 Oriole Drive, East Gwillimbury	Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
24	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	2154000 Ontario Inc.	15940 Bathurst Street, King	Request for lands to be removed from Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Area and Greenbelt Plan Area. Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
25	Humphries Planning Inc	Owners of 10436, 10450 Huntington Road	10436, 10450 Huntington Road, Vaughan	Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR. Property is currently within the 'Whitebelt' in Block 66E in Vaughan.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
26	Weston Consulting	P. Campagna Investments Ltd.	12162 Woodbine Avenue, 11670 Woodbine Avenue, 11851 Woodbine Avenue, 11767 Woodbine Avenue, 11674 Warden Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR for employment purposes. The properties are primarily within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Greenbelt Plan areas. A small portion of land is 'Whitebelt'.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
27	Weston Consulting	Laurentel Developments	10961 Cold Creek Road, Vaughan	Request for lands to be brought into the urban boundary through the MCR for employment purposes. The property is currently within the 'Whitebelt' lands in north west Vaughan.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
28	Devine Park LLP	Elgin Mills Markham Ltd.	4716 Elgin Mills Road East, Markham	Request to include identified property in urban expansion area.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
29	Evans Planning Inc.	Sharon Road Holding Company (857 Mount Albert Road); Oxford Developments (18839 2nd Concession Road)	857 Mount Albert Road and 18839 2nd Concession Road, East Gwillimbury	Request to include lands in urban area.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
30	Arshia Delfani & Roya Rezaee	Arshia Delfani & Roya Rezaee	1915 Farr Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Request to redesignate land as urban based on nature of surrounding land, freeway, etc.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
31	Harper Dell & Associates		14897 and 14773 Leslie Street, Aurora	Request to redesignate Part W 1/2 Lots 17 and 18, Cons 3 EYS from ORMCP Countryside to Settlement Area	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
32	Weston Consulting	Marino D'Allesandro	2062 Farr Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Request to include whitebelt lands in urban boundary (extending urban boundary slightly west from adjacent parcels in the Sharon Community)	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
33	Kian Kashani	Kashani & Co. Investment Inc., Kashani & Kashani Inc.	21170 Woodbine Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Consider lands for site specific zoning or inclusion within future expansions to the urban area to support the ongoing growth of York Region.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
34	Weston Consulting	Di Poce Real Estate Holdings Limited	11720 Highway 27, Vaughan	Request for Urban boundary expansion on the eastern portion of the lands outside of the Greenbelt.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Although the subject property is within the urban expansion area, a preliminary review indicates little to no developable area.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
35	KLM Planning Partnership	Robintide Farms Limited	2720 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Request for removal of the ORMCP/redesignation portion of the west lands; the appropriate long-term use of the west lands will be for urban uses.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
36	Weston Consulting		6990 Nashville Road, Vaughan	The subject property is currently located approximately 2 kilometers north of the City of Vaughan's Urban Boundary. Request for staff to consider potential future development of these lands in its growth management analysis.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
37	Armstrong Planning	Vanda Buttarazzi and Kalid Yusuf	5920 Kirby Road and 11561 Highway 27, Vaughan	Request for a minor expansion of the Urban Boundary up to the Greenbelt Boundary to accommodate future residential uses.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Although the subject property is within the urban expansion area, a preliminary review indicates little to no developable area.
38	Premier Realty Consulting Limited	Di Poce Real Estate Limited	11720 Kipling Avenue, Vaughan	Applicant requests that as part of the Region's MCR and the City's Official Plan Review process to consider lands outside the Greenbelt for future community area development.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Although the subject property is within the urban expansion area, a preliminary review indicates little to no developable area.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
39	Weston Consulting	Sarai Trucking Limited	11151 Highway 50, 11050 Cold Creek Road, 11065 Highway 50, Vaughan	Request for subject property to be included in the Urban Area designation.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
40	Thorstone Consulting Services	685109 Ontario Ltd. (Geo A. Kelson Company)	236 Doane Road, East Gwillimbury	That the land at 236 Doane Road, in the Town of East Gwillimbury, be identified as a "Future Urban Area".	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
41	Evans Planning	Ann Lee Chong and Teddy Chong	641 Queensville Sideroad, East Gwillimbury	Request to update the Region's Greenbelt protected countryside layer and to request including the lands within the urban boundary to allow for urban expansion.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
42	Evans Planning Inc.	2nd Concession Landowners Group	18899, 18839 2nd Concession Road, 893, 857 Mount Albert Road, East Gwillimbury	Applicant requests to bring the subject lands (agricultural area) into the urban area.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
43	Groundswell Urban Planners Inc.	Marianneville Stonehaven Developments Limited (Kerbel Group)	18813, 18881 and 18737 Bathurst Street, and 356 Morning Sideroad, East Gwillimbury	Request for urban expansion northward to include the subject lands with the development of Whitebelt lands to occur north of Green Lane.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
44	The Biglieri Group Ltd.	Holland Green Developments Inc.	Part of Lot 106, Concession 1, West of Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	A request to re-designate the lands from Agriculture to future Settlement Area.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
45	Weston Consulting	Paul and Doris Nessim	PT LT 29 CON 7 PTS 1, 2 & 3 65R11933, Vaughan	The purpose of this submission is to formally request consideration for an Urban Area Boundary Expansion through the Region's MCR.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
46	MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture	Liberty Development Corporation (1596630 Ontario Ltd.)	19350 Woodbine Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Requesting that the York Region expands the Queensville settlement through the MCR process to accommodate employment purposes on Whitebelt lands.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
47	Thorstone Consulting Services	Thomas & Martin Pick	21045 2nd Concession Road, East Gwillimbury	Requesting that mostly Whitebelt lands be considered for future urban expansion employment lands.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
48	Dentons Canada LLP	Flato Developments and Wyview Group	12650 Highway 27 & 13235 10th Concession, King	Request for lands to be considered for inclusion in the Nobleton Community settlement area.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas). Additional growth beyond the serviced capacity limit in the current environmental assessment is not being proposed based on preliminary financial assessments for the community of Nobleton.
49	KLM Planning Properties Inc.	Yarmosh Holdings Inc. c/o DG Group	11665 Jane Street, Vaughan	Request for lands to be included within the Urban Boundary for the City of Vaughan through the MCRP process.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
50	Margaret Orsi and Domenic & Pina Greco	Margaret Orsi and Domenic & Pina Greco	13044 Ninth Line (Margaret Orsi) and 12958 Ninth Line (Domenic & Pina Greco), Whitchurch-Stouffville	Urban Area Expansion (York Region) and inclusion into the official plan and secondary plan area (Town of Whitchurch- Stouffville).	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
51	MHBC Planning	DiBattista Farms Ltd/Signature Communities	11180, 11300, 11340 Huntington Road, Vaughan	Request that the lands be included in the urban boundary expansion as "future urban area."	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Although the subject properties are within the urban expansion area, a preliminary review indicates little to no developable area.
52	Dr. Keith Watson	Dr. Keith Watson	18004 Leslie Street, East Gwillimbury	Seeking to have Whitebelt land included in the Settlement Area of East Gwillimbury.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
53	Weston Consulting		11561 Highway 27, Vaughan	Request consideration of the southern portion of the subject lands (currently white belt) for inclusion within the Urban Area limits of the City of Vaughan in the Region of York Official Plan.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas). For the 'Whitebelt' portion of the lands, a number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion.
54	Groundswell Urban Planners Inc.	2561371 Ontario Inc.	5612 Lakeshore Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	The subject property is designated ORM Countryside Area. The request for consideration to include the subject property into the urban boundary.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
55	Weston Consulting	Laurentel Developments	6910 Roe Road, Vaughan	Formally request consideration for the inclusion of the subject properties within the Urban Area through the Region's MCR.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
56	SOL-Arch	Jerry Xu	6336 Bloomington Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Interested to be included in the York Region's Boundary Expansion Plan for Hamlet of Bloomington	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
57	CBRE Limited	Mary Friedrich	4050 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Client seeks that an expansion of the urban boundary includes the subject lands within Block 42 for future urban uses, and that property is included in budgetary discussions for the expansion of the Urban Area	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
58	Stella Ventura	Antonio and Antoinietta Guida (parents of Stella Ventura)	4100 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Submission to support that the current MCR review include subject lands located within Block 42 in the proposed urban expansion boundary.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
59	WSP	1860938 Ontario Ltd. (Sam Morra)	Pt of Lot 32, Concession 11, Vaughan	Applicant is requesting that the Subject Area, including the Subject Property, be included within York Region's Urban Area Boundary for use as a mix of affordable residential and employment uses.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.
60	Henry Li, Representative of Centraland	Jerry Xu	13962 Ninth Line, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Interested to be included in the York Region's Boundary Expansion Plan for Hamlet of Bloomington	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
61	Weston Consulting		18609A Highway 48 & 18784 Centre Street, East Gwillimbury	Formally request consideration for the subject properties for inclusion in the Town and Villages designation of the York Region OP.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
62	Weston Consulting		(Pt Lot 31 Con 8 VAUGHN) or 00 Kirby Road, Vaughan	Formally request consideration for the subject property to be included in the Urban Area limits of the Region of York OP.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
63	Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd.	Sundial Homes (Green Lane) Limited	22 Green Lane West, East Gwillimbury	Requests the inclusion of a small, isolated piece of land currently used for agriculture in the urban boundary.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
64	Dentons Canada LLP	Flato Developments Inc., Wyview Group	Highway 48 and Dickson Hill Road, Markham	Request the Region include these lands as part of a settlement area expansion. Clients intend to develop a full mixed use community focused on age-friendly development, including seniors housing.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. Subject to Provincial MZO.
65	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	Northeast Markham Landowners Group (NEMLG)	North of Major Mackenzie Drive East and east of McCowan Road, Markham	NEMLG respectfully requests that their lands be included within an expansion to the City of Markham urban boundary through the MCR process.	The lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
66	MGP	Vianova Group Inc.	2005 Bethesda Side Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Request of Vianova Group Inc. to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for a Minister's Zoning Order to permit Light Employment and industrial development on a site outside the Town's settlement area boundary; site is designated Oak Ridges Moraine Countryside where Light Employment industrial development is not permitted in the Town and Region's Official Plans.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
67	Tagrid Rokan	Tagrid Rokan	5026 Bethesda Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Inquiring about urban boundary expansion and the possibility of future development.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).
68	Ashish Patel	Ashish Patel	13187 Ninth Line, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Inquiring for future potential boundary expansion of Stouffville	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
69	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	1324534 Ontario Inc (Thomas and Martin Pick)	18733, 18719, 18645 Old Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	That the area generally described as the lands east of Old Yonge Road north of Green Lane East, be identified as a "Future Urban Area" within the draft land budget for 2041 and the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.
70	MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture	Liberty Development Corporation (1596630 Ontario Ltd.)	Part Lot 13 & 14, Conc 3, East Gwillimbury	Expand the Sharon settlement area to permit a mix of residential and population-related employment on Whitebelt land.	The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
71	Prudence Management Inc.	1078703 Ontario Limited	20913 Leslie Street, East Gwillimbury	Applicant requests that the subject lands be included in the Urban Boundary with the new Official Plan.	A number of considerations informed the identification of preliminary urban expansion areas. Staff are not recommending these lands be included in the preliminary urban boundary expansion. *Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.

Table 2: Municipal Requests

Note: Any lands ultimately identified for urban expansion would be subject to further studies to determine the extent of developable area.

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
72	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	<p>1) Areas east of Highway 404, between the southern boundary of the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville and Bethesda Sideroad.</p> <p>2) Area between the southern boundary of the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville and west of McCowan Road</p>	<p>That the subject lands be included into the Provincially Significant Employment Zones. The Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville also endorsed an expansion of the urban settlement boundary.</p>	<p>1) In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).</p> <p>2) The lands are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.</p>
73	Town of East Gwillimbury	Town of East Gwillimbury	<p>Various parcels in the central and western sections of East Gwillimbury</p>	<p>THAT Council endorses the need to include the "Whitebelt" lands within the Town as part of the "Urban Area" in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) through the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process in order to create complete communities, coordinate infrastructure planning and accommodate residential and employment growth to the year 2041 and beyond.</p>	<p>A portion of the lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan are included within the preliminary urban boundary expansion based on the Province's mandated land needs assessment.</p> <p>*Preliminary distribution of the quantum of urban expansion required based on the proposed forecast for the Town of East Gwillimbury is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and Town of East Gwillimbury staff.</p>

#	Submitted by	On Behalf of	Location or Address	Nature of Request	Comments
74	MPlan Inc., City of Richmond Hill	Leslie Stouffville Landowners Association	Northeast Richmond Hill, surrounding the Gormley GO Station	Request that Countryside designated area be redesignated to settlement area, and that lands south of Bethesda Road are not to be considered within a prime agricultural area.	In accordance with Provincial policies, urban uses are not being proposed within the Greenbelt Plan or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (beyond existing settlement areas).

ATTACHMENT 3

#	Address	1) Transportation Infrastructure	2) Efficient Servicing	3) Contiguous to Urban Area	4) Logical Planning Boundaries	5) Agricultural Value	6) YROP Land Use Designation	York Region Recommendation	# of Criteria Met	Notes
1	4044 Elgin Mills Road East, Markham	None	Yes	No	Yes	High	Whitebelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment and Community)	2	Divides land between King Township and Vaughan.
2	12700 7th Concession, King	Provincial (HWY 400)	No	No	No	Low	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	2	
3	5511 King Vaughan Road, Vaughan	None	No	No	Yes	High	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	1	
4	1136 Teston Road, Vaughan	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	ORM (Countryside/NL)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	4	
5	3230 King Road, King	Provincial (HWY 400 and King City GO)	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	3.5	
6	12470 Weston Road, King	Provincial (HWY 400)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	1	
7	11737 McCowan Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (HWY 400 and Stouffville GO)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	1	
8	1775 Bethesda Road, 12471 Leslie Street, 1700 Stouffville Road, Richmond Hill	Provincial (HWY 400 and Gormley GO Station)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	5	
9	11180 Huntington Road, 6901 Kirby Road, 7001 Kirby Road, and 7055 Kirby Road, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	4.5	
10	5172 Provincial Mackenzie Drive East, Markham	Provincial and Regional (Provincial Mackenzie Drive and Mount Joy GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	4.5	
11	11600 Keele Street, Vaughan	Regional (Keele Street)	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	4.5	
12	18823 Old Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 400 and East Gw. GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	5	
13	12820 Bathurst Street, King	Provincial (King City GO)	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	3.5	
14	11871 Albion Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	4.5	

15	12441 Woodbine Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (HWY 404 and Gormley GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	5	Adjacent to LSLA lands.
16	18618 Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Provincial and Regional (East Gw. GO and Yonge Street)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	5	Outside the municipal boundaries of Richmond Hill and not contiguous to King City - does not fall within logical planning boundaries. Did not meet criteria for inclusion.
17	1070 Nashville Road, Vaughan	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	4	
18	11691 Warden Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (HWY 404 and Gormley GO)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	1	
19	4995-5015 Lloydtown/Aurora Road and 16425 8th Concession, King	None	No	No	No	High	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	0	
20	2354 Ravenshoe Road, Georgina	Provincial (HWY 400)	No	No	No	High	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1	
21	20590 Highway 11, King	Provincial and Regional (Bradford GO and HWY 11)	No	Yes	No	None	Greenbelt/Holland Marsh SCA	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	3	
22	12011 Pine Valley Drive, Vaughan	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	No	None	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Inclusion (Community and Employment)	2	
23	198 Oriole Drive, East Gwillimbury	Regional (HWY 11)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Exclusion 2 (Did not meet criteria)	4.5	Part of the land was excluded as it is designated GB/ORM, and the rest was excluded as it did not meet the inclusion criteria.
24	15940 Bathurst Street, King	Regional (St. John's Sideroad and Bathurst Street).	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	3	
25	10436, 10450 Huntington Road, Vaughan	Provincial and Regional (HWY 427 and 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	5	
26	12162 Woodbine Avenue, 11670 Woodbine Avenue, 11851 Woodbine Avenue, 11767 Woodbine Avenue, 11674 Warden Avenue, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (HWY 404 and Gormley GO)	Yes	No	No	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	2.5	These lands were granted an MZO.

27	10961 Cold Creek Road, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Employment)	4	
28	4716 Elgin Mills Road East, Markham	None	No	No	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	1.5	
29	857 Mount Albert Road and 18839 2nd Concession Road, East Gwillimbury	Provincial and Regional (HWY 404 and HWY 11/Yonge Street)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	4.5	
30	1915 Farr Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	5	
31	14897 and 14773 Leslie Street, Aurora	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	4.5	
32	2062 Farr Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	4.5	
33	21170 Woodbine Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	No	High	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1	Included in both Proposed and Alternate Scenarios
34	11720 Highway 27, Vaughan	Provincial and Regional (HWY 427 and 27)	No	No	Yes	High	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	2	
35	2720 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Provincial (HWY 427)	Yes	No	No	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	2.5	
36	6990 Nashville Road, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	No	No	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	2	
37	5920 Kirby Road and 11561 Highway 27, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 27)	No	No	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	1	Recommendation will fragment the farmland.
38	11720 Kipling Avenue, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 27)	No	No	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	2.5	
39	11151 Highway 50, 11050 Cold Creek Road, 11065 Highway 50, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	4.5	
40	236 Doane Road, East Gwillimbury	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Regional Greenlands	Exclusion 2 (Did not meet criteria)	4	
41	641 Queensville Sideroad, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Exclusion 2 (Did not meet criteria)	2.5	
42	18899, 18839 2nd Concession Road, 893, 857 Mount Albert Road, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	5	

43	18813, 18881 and 18737 Bathurst Street, and 356 Morning Sideroad, East Gwillimbury	Regional (HWY 1/Yonge Street)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Exclusion 2 (Did not meet criteria)	4	
44	Part of Lot 106, Concession 1, West of Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Provincial and Regional (East G. GO Station and HWY 11)	Yes	Yes	No	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	4	
45	PT LT 29 CON 7 PTS 1, 2 & 3 65R11933, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 27)	Yes	Yes	No	Low	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	3.5	
46	19350 Woodbine Avenue, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	Yes	High	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	2	
47	21045 2nd Concession Road, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt	Exclusion 2 (Did not meet criteria)	1	Nearly all the land recommended for inclusion and only a small part remains GB.
48	12650 Highway 27 & 13235 10th Concession, King	Regional (HWY 27)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	4	
49	11665 Jane Street, Vaughan	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	4.5	
50	13044 Ninth Line (Margaret Orsi) and 12958 Ninth Line (Domenic & Pina Greco), Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial and Regional (King City GO and HWY 48)	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1.5	
51	11180, 11300, 11340 Huntington Road, Vaughan	None	No	No	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	2	
52	18004 Leslie Street, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404 and East Gw. GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	5	Land is already developed, but is not contiguous to urban uses.
53	11561 Highway 27, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 27)	No	No	Yes	Low	Greenbelt	Exclusion 1 and 2	2.5	
54	5612 Lakeshore Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Regional (HWY 48)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside/Hamlet)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	4.5	Large continuous block of farmland that is close (not adjacent) to a growing Stouffville.
55	6910 Roe Road, Vaughan	None	Yes	No	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	3	
56	6336 Bloomington Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	None	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	0.5	

57	4050 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	1
58	4100 King-Vaughan Road, Vaughan	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	No	No	High	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	1
59	Pt of Lot 32, Concession 11, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	4.5
60	13962 Ninth Line, Whitchurch-Stouffville	None	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	0.5
61	18609A Highway 48 & 18784 Centre Street, East Gwillimbury	Regional (HWY 48)	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1
62	PT Lot 31 Con 8 Vaughan or 00 Kirby Road, Vaughan	Regional (HWY 27)	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1
63	22 Green Lane West, East Gwillimbury	Provincial and Regional (East Gw. GO and HWY 1/Yonge Street)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Urban Area	Exclusion 2	4.5
64	Highway 48 and Dickson Hill Road, Markham	Regional (HWY 48)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	4
65	North of Provincial Mackenzie Drive East and east of McCowan Road, Markham	Provincial (Mount Joy GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt/Greenbelt	Partial Inclusion (Community)	4.5
66	2005 Bethesda Side Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	5
67	5026 Bethesda Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial and Regional (Stouffville GO and HWY 48)	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1.5
68	13187 Ninth Line, Whitchurch-Stouffville	Provincial (Stouffville GO)	No	No	No	Medium	ORM (Natural Linkage)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	1.5
69	18733, 18719, 18645 Old Yonge Street, East Gwillimbury	Regional (HWY 1/Yonge Street)	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	3

70 Part Lot 13 &14, Conc 3, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	Yes	No	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Employment)	4
71 20913 Leslie Street, East Gwillimbury	Provincial (HWY 404)	No	Yes	Yes	Medium	Greenbelt	Exclusion 2	3.5
72 Areas east of Highway 404, between the southern boundary of the Town of Whitchurch- Stouffville and Bethesda Sideroad	Provincial (HWY 404 and Gormley GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	5
73 Area between the southern boundary of the Town of Whitchurch- Stouffville and west of McCowan Road	Regional (HWY 48)	No	Yes	Yes	Low	Whitebelt	Inclusion (Community)	3.5
74 LSLA	Provincial (HWY 404 and Gormley GO)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low	ORM (Countryside)	Exclusion 1 (GB/ORM Land)	5
75 Town of East Gwillimbury								
Request to have all Whitebelt lands included in the urban expansion.								