

**From:** Clerks@vaughan.ca <Clerks@vaughan.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2022 10:59 AM  
**To:** Regional Clerk <ClerkGeneralLine@york.ca>  
**Subject:** Item 4, Committee of the Whole Report No. 12, Council March 22, 2022

---

*Sent on behalf of Todd Coles, City Clerk*

Mr. Christopher Raynor, Regional Clerk  
The Regional Municipality of York  
17250 Yonge Street  
Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1

Dear Mr. Raynor:

**RE: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS: DRAFT YORK REGION OFFICIAL PLAN**

Attached for your information is **Item 4, Report No. 12**, of the Committee of the Whole regarding the above-noted matter, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan at its meeting of March 22, 2022.

I draw your attention to the report recommendation as follows:

2. *That this report and Attachment 1 be forwarded to York Region as the City's comments on the Draft York Region Official Plan.*

***To assist us in responding to inquiries, please quote the item and report number.***

Sincerely,

**Todd Coles**  
**City Clerk**  
905-832-8504 | [clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:clerks@vaughan.ca)

**City of Vaughan | Office of the City Clerk**  
2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1  
[vaughan.ca](http://vaughan.ca)



## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 2022**

Item 4, Report No. 12, of the Committee of the Whole, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on March 22, 2022, as follows:

***By approving the recommendation contained in the report of the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management, dated March 8, 2022.***

#### **4. REQUEST FOR COMMENTS: DRAFT YORK REGION OFFICIAL PLAN**

The Committee of the Whole recommends:

1. That consideration of this matter be referred to the Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) meeting of March 8, 2022; and
2. That the following communication be received:
  - C3. Cam Milani, Rizmi Holdings Limited, dated March 7, 2022.

#### **Recommendations**

1. That the City staff comments on the November 11, 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan, as summarized in this report and detailed in Attachment 1, be endorsed; and
2. That this report and Attachment 1 be forwarded to York Region as the City's comments on the Draft York Region Official Plan.

## Committee of the Whole (2) Report

---

**DATE:** Tuesday, March 8, 2022

**WARD(S):** ALL

**TITLE:** REQUEST FOR COMMENTS: DRAFT YORK REGION OFFICIAL PLAN

**FROM:**

Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Growth Management

**ACTION:** DECISION

---

### **Purpose**

To seek Council endorsement of City staff comments on the November 11, 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan.

### **Report Highlights**

- York Region is updating the York Region Official Plan through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process with an intended adoption date of mid-2022.
- York Region has requested that local municipal Councils submit comments on the draft York Region Official Plan by March 31, 2022.
- City staff is generally supportive of the proposed policies in the draft York Region Official Plan, subject to the comments identified herein and further clarification regarding roles and implementation tools.
- It is critical that York Region ensure the required capacities for water, sewer and transit infrastructure will be provided in a timely manner, to support the higher intensification target set by York Region that exceeds the minimum set out by the Growth Plan.
- City staff request that York Region clarify and revise Map 1A and Map 8 in the draft York Region Official Plan to ensure that Rural Areas, Hamlets and Secondary Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas in Vaughan are designated accurately.
- City staff suggest stronger policies to protect and restore natural systems and support sustainability.

## **Recommendations**

1. That the City staff comments on the November 11, 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan, as summarized in this report and detailed in Attachment 1, be endorsed; and
2. That this report and Attachment 1 be forwarded to York Region as the City's comments on the Draft York Region Official Plan.

## **Background**

### ***Section 26 of the Planning Act requires York Region to update the York Region Official Plan***

The *Planning Act* is provincial legislation that sets the rules for land use planning in Ontario and provides the basis for preparing official plans and planning policies at the municipal level. Section 26 of the *Planning Act* requires that an official plan be reviewed every 5 to 10 years to ensure conformity with Provincial plans and address changing local circumstances. York Region's current official plan, York Region Official Plan 2010 (YROP), was adopted by Council in 2009. It is required that regional municipalities bring their official plans into conformity with updated Provincial policies by July 1, 2022.

### ***A Municipal Comprehensive Review is the planning process used to bring a regional official plan into conformity with Provincial plans and policies***

Various policy matters have been updated in the Growth Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS) which impact the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) and require updates to the YROP. A critical policy consideration is outlined in Policy 2.2.1.5 of A Place to Grow: Growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2020 (Growth Plan) which states, "The Minister will establish a methodology for assessing land needs to implement this Plan, including relevant assumptions and other direction as required. This methodology will be used by upper- and single-tier municipalities to assess the quantity of land required to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan" (2051). Specifically, the methodology is used by municipalities to ensure there is an adequate supply of land to accommodate housing needs, support more jobs and attract business investment. It informs whether urban area boundary expansions are needed and the potential need for the conversion of employment lands to other land uses. The MCR process is undertaken in accordance with the Provincial land needs assessment methodology.

***York Region is updating the York Region Official Plan, 2010 through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process***

The MCR is a multi-year undertaking initiated by York Region in May 2014 to update the YROP, 2010. Due to reviews and subsequent amendments to Provincial plans (Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan) and the PPS, and delays in the release of the Provincial Land Needs Assessment methodology, the MCR was delayed. Ultimately, York Region Council approved a work plan for the MCR in 2018 and the project resumed.

***The MCR requires York Region to undertake complex studies, and projects and includes extensive consultation and collaboration with the nine local municipalities***

York Region identified a number of MCR strategy documents and background studies required to ensure conformity with the Growth Plan. Most of this work was undertaken between 2019 to 2021. Major undertakings as part of the MCR work include:

- Regional and Local Municipal Population and Employment Forecasts Update
- Regional Land Budget
- Intensification Strategy (including identification of targets and strategic growth areas and Major Transit Station Area analysis)
- Employment Strategy
- Housing Strategy
- Density Visualizations for New Community Areas and Intensification Areas
- Climate Change Initiatives such as a York Region Community Energy Plan as part of an overall Regional Climate Action Plan
- Infrastructure/Fiscal Integration (including fiscal impact analysis and updates to the York Region Transportation Master Plan and Water and Wastewater Master Plan)
- YROP Policy Review and Update

***In Q2 2021, York Region circulated the preliminary draft of the YROP policies to lower-tier municipal planning staff for review and comment***

City staff completed a review of the preliminary draft of the YROP policies and provided comments to Regional staff in late Q2 2021 for consideration in the preparation of the final draft. Additional work in several policy areas and mapping updates informed further reporting by Regional staff to York Region Council. This phase of work was completed in Q4 2021.

In Q1 2021, York Region released its Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment report, and in Q3 2021 held a Special Council Meeting to present and

discuss alternative scenarios identified in the covering report. The timing of the draft YROP was dependent on York Region Council providing direction on the forecast presented at the Special Council Meeting in Q3 2021. At a Special Council Meeting in Q4 2021, York Region Council endorsed the staff recommendation of a phased 50-55% intensification scenario as the basis for the updated YROP.

York Region will continue engagement with the public, local municipalities, conservation authorities, Indigenous Communities, the Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD) – York Chapter and other stakeholders until adoption of the YROP. The YROP is intended to be adopted by mid-2022.

***The draft York Region Official Plan was brought to York Region Council in November 2021***

On November 11, 2021, York Region Committee of the Whole was presented with the draft YROP for the purpose of review and ongoing engagement with local municipalities, conservation authorities, Indigenous Communities, BILD – York Chapter, and the public. During this time, ongoing work to incorporate Council’s direction on the proposed 2051 forecast and land needs assessment was still being undertaken. To implement York Region Council’s direction, Regional staff had to update mapping to include any modifications to designations, overlays and identifications and re-calculate the distribution of population, employment, and housing units to reflect the phased 50-55% intensification scenario, per the direction of York Region Council. A revised draft YROP, including revisions to Table 1: Local Municipal Population and Employment Forecasts, Table 6: Local Municipal Intensification Units, and applicable maps, was delivered to York Region Council on November 25, 2021.

***York Region is soliciting comments on the draft York Region Official Plan from local municipalities by March 31, 2022***

Consistent with the statutory requirements of the *Planning Act*, public and stakeholder consultation for the draft YROP will continue until Regional Council adopts its updated YROP, which is targeted for mid-2022. York Region has worked closely with local municipalities in the development and review of policy directions to ensure feasible implementation of Regional policies at the local level. As York Region continues to collaborate with local municipalities throughout the MCR process, York Region has requested that local municipal Council comments on the draft YROP be submitted by March 31, 2022 to ensure all comments can be considered and addressed prior to Regional Council adoption. This timeline is necessary to ensure York Region meets the Provincial deadline of July 1, 2022 to bring the YROP into conformity with updated Provincial policies.

## **Previous Reports/Authority**

[Major Transit Station Areas, March 9, 2020](#)

[York Region's Request to Consider New Major Transit Station Areas \(MTSA\) Along Jane Street and Expand the Rutherford GO Station MTSA File 27.3, June 1, 2021](#)

[York Region Presentation on Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment, May 12, 2021](#)

[Request for Comment York Region Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment, June 8, 2021](#)

[Statutory Initiation of the Vaughan Official Plan Review 2051, October 13, 2021](#)

## **Analysis and Options**

***The draft YROP has restructured YROP 2010 to provide clearer policy direction and aid in the implementation of Regional policies at the local level***

The draft YROP is organized into seven chapters and has a strong emphasis on the protection and enhancement of agricultural and natural systems, sustainable growth management, and complete communities. The seven chapters of the draft YROP are as follows:

- Chapter 1: Introduction and Purpose
- Chapter 2: The Foundation for Complete Communities
- Chapter 3: A Sustainable Natural Environment
- Chapter 4: An Urbanizing Region
- Chapter 5: Supporting the Agricultural System
- Chapter 6: Servicing Our Communities
- Chapter 7: Implementation of the Official Plan

City staff provide the following comments on the draft YROP released in November 2021 as set out in this report and Attachment 1. City staff recommend that such comments be endorsed and forwarded to York Region as the City's formal comments on the draft YROP.

### ***City staff generally support the proposed changes to the York Region Official Plan***

City staff is generally supportive of the proposed policies in the draft York Region Official Plan, subject to comments identified in this report and Attachment 1, and further clarification regarding roles and implementation tools.

The draft YROP includes updated mapping, strengthened policies to protect agricultural and natural systems and updates to the regional structure to accommodate projected population and employment growth. City staff comments were informed by on-going consultation between Regional and City staff.

### **City Staff Comments on the Draft York Region Official Plan**

York Region has requested the City provide its comments on the draft YROP to York Region by March 31, 2022.

#### ***Additional clarification is needed on several policies to distinguish between the roles and responsibilities of the local municipalities and York Region***

Clarification on the respective roles of the local municipalities versus York Region is needed in several policy areas to ensure efficient implementation at the local level. City staff recommend that all pertinent policies clearly identify whether they are directed solely to York Region, or to the local municipalities, or are shared responsibilities. For policies to be implemented at the local level, City staff request York Region provide further clarity on implementation tools and the obligations of the local municipality.

#### ***City staff support York Region's population and employment forecast to 2051 pertaining to the City of Vaughan, as set out in the draft YROP***

It is the responsibility of York Region to establish population and employment forecasts to 2051 for its nine local municipalities. Vaughan Policy Planning staff brought a report to Council on June 8, 2021 detailing comments on the March 2021 Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment. At the time, York Region was considering a 50% intensification scenario. York Region had forecasted that Vaughan would have a total population of 568,700 people and 352,000 jobs. City staff noted in the report that Vaughan's experience with growth over the past ten years shows the forecasted growth is likely to be met and exceeded.

In response to consultation between York Region and its local municipalities, York Region presented alternate 2051 forecast and land needs assessment scenarios. On October 21, 2021, York Region Council endorsed the York Region staff recommendation of a phased 50-55% intensification scenario to be incorporated into the draft YROP. Table 1 in the draft YROP has been updated to reflect the decision of York Region Council and Vaughan is forecasted to grow by 228,800 people and 111,400 jobs by 2051, bringing the total population to 570,400 people and 351,500 jobs. There is a minor increase to the forecasted population and employment numbers for Vaughan as a



result of the phased 50-55% intensification scenario. It is critical that York Region ensure the required capacities for water, sewer and transit infrastructure will be provided in a timely manner, in accordance with the higher intensification target set by York Region that exceeds the minimum set out by the Growth Plan.

It is important to note that the next statutory review of the YROP will be within 5 to 10 years wherein the intensification scenario can be revisited if necessary. As such, City staff support the population and employment forecast to 2051 developed for the City of Vaughan.

***York Region's population and employment forecast for Vaughan will be partially implemented by bringing all remaining Whitebelt lands into the Urban Area***

The Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment report identified that 80% of York Region's Whitebelt lands will be needed to accommodate the planned growth and unit mix, and the remaining 20% will be needed to accommodate growth beyond 2051. The Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment report states that "planning for 80% of the Whitebelt allows the Region to take a focused approach to planning for growth to 2051 and allows for leveraging of existing infrastructure investments, staging and phasing of new infrastructure, and growing in a financially sustainable manner". One of the intents is to provide for a variety of housing unit types which would meet the projected needs of future population growth out to 2051.

Of the total 3,400 hectares of Whitebelt lands in York Region needed to achieve the proposed urban expansion, York Region is moving forward with the decision to add all of Vaughan's remaining Whitebelt lands (1,210 hectares) as urban area to accommodate population and employment growth to 2051. The 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment report notes that adding all of Vaughan's remaining Whitebelt lands into the urban area will support a population of 90,000 people and 40,000 jobs within the Whitebelt lands, while building upon existing strengths in transportation and warehousing in West Vaughan, and leveraging strong employment growth potential along Highway 427. It will also leverage the infrastructure investments of the existing downstream wastewater infrastructure that York Region has made over the past two decades.

***Vaughan has a substantial number of Major Transit Station Areas that are planned to support significant growth and supported by policy updates in the draft YROP***

Vaughan staff worked extensively with York Region to inform the Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) draft boundaries, as well as minimum population and employment

densities. A significant portion of the growth allocated to Vaughan will occur within its MTSAs. Section 4.4.2, Regional Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas in the draft YROP require local municipalities, such as Vaughan, to update their official plans and secondary plans to be consistent with the MTSA policies in the draft YROP. This section provides guidance to local municipalities to do so and specifies the roles and responsibilities for local municipalities to implement the Regional MTSA policies. This Section also emphasizes that development in MTSAs shall support the Regional intensification targets and make best use of York Region's infrastructure investments, while developing complete communities. The MTSA policies give local municipalities the flexibility to establish land use designations, building height requirements and transit-supportive densities that will aid in achieving the minimum density targets in each MTSA. Staff are supportive of these new MTSA policies in the draft YROP.

It is also important to note the delineation of MTSA boundaries, as well as the recommended densities, building heights, and land uses cannot be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). The *Planning Act* restricts official plan and zoning appeals to the OLT for areas identified as MTSAs in both the regional and local official plans. The following matters cannot be appealed to the OLT:

- MTSA boundaries
- minimum number of residents and jobs per hectare
- minimum or maximum densities and building heights
- approved land uses

***City staff request clarification and changes to Map 1A and Map 8 in the draft YROP***

- City staff request clarification pertaining to properties designated as 'Rural Areas' on proposed Map 1A located within the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Prior to the proposed mapping updates in the draft YROP, Vaughan had only one site designated 'Rural Area' within the Agricultural System. The proposed updates to Map 1A designates lands in Vaughan as 'Rural Area' within the urban settlement area boundary. Clarification is needed from York Region to understand why additional lands outside of the linear river valleys of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside have been added to the inventory of Rural Areas on Map 1A.
- City staff request that the Hamlet designation be removed from proposed Map 1A for Purpleville. The heritage properties in the Purpleville Hamlet were removed from the *Listing of Property of Architectural and Historical Significance* in Spring 2020 after they were destroyed by fire. The Purpleville Wesleyan Methodist Cemetery is the only cultural heritage feature remaining in the landscape.

City staff also recommend updating Map 1A to add the Hamlet designation to Teston, located at the northeast corner of Teston Road and Jane Street. Teston has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape through the Block 27 Secondary Plan and the City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010.

- City staff request that Map 8 be amended by removing the ‘Secondary Mineral Aggregate Resource Area’ Designation from all lands located in the City of Vaughan due to the fact that all such lands are either developed with urban uses or are in proximity of uses that are incompatible with an aggregate extraction use.

***Policy 5.1.8 should identify local municipalities as the approval authority for determining new non-agricultural uses***

Policy 5.1.8 outlines criteria for limited new non-agricultural uses that may be permitted within the Agricultural System. As part of the criteria, completion of an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is required to the satisfaction of York Region. The current processes do not require York Region staff to review AIAs and City staff request clarification from York Region on this matter. Policy 5.1.8 should identify local municipalities as the approval authority for determining new non-agricultural uses.

***Stronger policies regarding sustainability and green development standards should be incorporated into the YROP***

An objective of the draft YROP, as outlined in Section 2.1, Regional Structure, is to “provide a framework for managing growth that protects the natural and agricultural systems, provides for complete communities and ensures economic vitality in a financially sustainable manner”. City staff recommend revising the language pertaining to sustainability in this chapter as the current references to the term ‘sustainability’ are limiting. City staff note that managing growth in a “financially sustainable manner” is not the main or only objective and that language regarding sustainability should be flexible to encompass the three pillars of sustainability: economic viability, environmental protection and social equity.

City staff recommend adding stronger policies requiring local municipalities to develop and implement green development standards. The draft YROP provides policies that require communities to be designed to the highest urban design and green development standards, however, it does not clearly identify the role of local municipalities to develop and/or implement green development standards. The Sustainability Metrics program, Vaughan’s Green Development Standards (GDS), was initiated in partnership with the cities of Richmond Hill and Brampton in 2013. The partnership was joined by Markham in 2020 and updates to the Sustainability Metrics were endorsed by Council in 2021. To

support policy implementation in local official plans, City staff recommends adding stronger language that references implementation tools for green standards at the local level, such as by-laws, financing mechanisms and incentives. This would encourage other regional municipalities to implement GDS and thereby achieve greater consistency across the region.

***City staff is supportive of updated proposed housing policies, subject to further clarification from York Region***

City staff is supportive of a new policy that requires a minimum of 1,000 new purpose-built rental units be developed region-wide on an annual basis. However, further clarification is needed regarding the strategies and incentives to implement the local municipal targets outlined in Table 2: Purpose Built Rental Target by Local Municipality. City staff note that given the barriers to financing and constructing purpose-built rental units, achieving the targets proposed in Table 2 will be challenging without clear direction and support from York Region. Continued work through the York Region/Local Municipal Housing Working Group is required to develop incentives and strategies to increase production of purpose-built rental developments.

City staff supports the need for strong policies that promote an appropriate mix and range of housing options, including affordable housing. City staff note that the minimum percent targets for new affordable housing units, both within and outside of Regional Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, remain challenging to implement and achieve. City staff request that York Region provide further clarification with reference to implementation tools for local municipalities to achieve the targets stated in the draft YROP.

A definition of “affordable housing” that does not differentiate between dwelling types and is calculated at a Region-wide scale often results in a low affordable ownership threshold, limiting the number of market units that meet this threshold. If possible, and within the parameters of the provincial definition of “affordable housing”, City staff recommend York Region consider different affordable ownership thresholds for various dwelling types, such as high-density and ground-related, applied to the market area of a local municipality.

***City staff request York Region develop standard excess soil reuse strategies for all local municipalities and revise Policy 2.5.1 accordingly***

The draft YROP includes Section 2.5: a new section on managing excess soil from development. The objective of Section 2.5 is to “work with conservation authorities and local municipalities to protect human health and the environment through the

management of excess soil”. Policy 2.5.1 states “that local municipalities should develop excess soil reuse strategies as part of planning for growth and development”. City staff encourage York Region to work with local municipalities to develop an excess soil guideline/strategy, to aid in the regulation of excess soils at the local municipal level. Furthermore, City staff recommend measures pertaining to the reuse of excess soil be included as Engineering Standards.

***Cultural Heritage policies should be updated to reflect the outcome of recent consultation with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation for the Vaughan Official Plan Review***

City staff has been engaging with Vaughan’s Indigenous Peoples since early in the Vaughan Official Plan Review (OPR) process to inform the OPR. It is the role of York Region to undertake its own engagement with Indigenous Peoples for the purposes of the MCR. That being said, City staff recommends the following revisions to the draft YROP, Section 2.4, Cultural Heritage (formerly Section 3.4), based on consultation between Vaughan and Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (MCFN) for the OPR.

1. First Nation and/or Metis should be contacted and informed at Stage 1 archaeological assessments. The current draft policies identify consultation at a Stage 2, however, MCFN has advised the City they would like to be engaged earlier in the process.
2. Policies with respect to Stage 4 archaeological assessments are not included in the draft YROP and should be added. City staff recommend local municipalities be informed when a Stage 4 archaeological assessment is required.
3. The language in the preamble and subsequent policies of Section 2.4 should be revised to ensure treaty rights and interest holders are differentiated, as per MCFN’s advisement.

City staff request that York Region provide further guidance to local municipalities on Indigenous engagement protocols and processes.

***Stronger policies to protect and restore natural systems need to be considered***

Proposed updates to policy 3.4.2.6 set the criteria for identifying significant woodlands. The 4-hectare threshold for significant woodlands in the Countryside designation means woodlands currently in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) would be eliminated. City staff recommend setting a threshold that would include and protect more woodlands. City staff recommend the criteria for woodlands that will not be considered significant, as outlined in proposed Policy 3.4.2.7, be removed or revised to allow more woodlands to be considered significant.

City staff note the focus of this policy section 3.4.2 should be to restore woodlands that meet a certain size threshold, including woodlands that have been negatively impacted due to invasive species or other factors. City staff recommend referring to the PPS, ORMCP Technical Papers, and Ecological Land Classification for guidance on defining woodlands to include more woodlands. Additionally, City staff recommend adding a policy to section 3.4.2 encouraging local municipalities to develop their own woodland compensation plan using York Region's principles outlined in section 3.4.2.

***The Environmental Impact Study requirement for community gardens in proposed policy 3.2.5 should be removed as it would be onerous and discourage urban agriculture in Vaughan***

Proposed updates to policy 3.2.3 states "that development and site alteration be prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System". Notwithstanding policy 3.2.3, policy 3.2.5 outlines uses that may be permitted in the Regional Greenlands System, subject to meeting requirements of the applicable Provincial plans. Policy 3.2.5 refers to community gardens as a permitted use so long as the community garden is in accordance with an approved Environmental Impact Study (EIS). City staff request the reference to community gardens be removed from policy 3.2.5 as requiring an EIS would be onerous for City staff and would discourage non-profit organizations and agencies from implementing urban agriculture in the City.

## **Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact.

## **Broader Regional Impacts/Considerations**

The proposed changes to the YROP will have direct implications on the nine local municipalities as each of the local municipal official plans must conform to the updated YROP once approved.

## **Conclusion**

York Region is required to bring its official plan into conformity with Provincial plans and policies by July 1, 2022. A high-level assessment of the November 2021 draft of the YROP is provided in the body of this report, and City staff's detailed March 2021 comments are provided in Attachment 1. City staff is generally supportive of the proposed policies in the November 2021 draft of the YROP, subject to the comments

outlined in the body of this report and Attachment 1. City staff recommend that this report and Attachment 1 be forwarded to York Region as the City's comments on the November 2021 draft of the YROP. City staff will continue to engage with York Region and support the development of the draft YROP through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process until the YROP is adopted in mid-2022.

**For more information**, please contact: Fausto Filippetto, Senior Manager of Policy Planning and Sustainability, extension 8699.

## **Attachments**

1. City of Vaughan Comments on Draft York Region Official Plan, City of Vaughan, March 2022

## **Prepared by**

Christina Bruce, Director, Policy Planning and Special Programs, extension 8231  
Fausto Filippetto, Senior Manager of Policy Planning and Sustainability, Policy Planning and Special Programs, extension 8699

Ash Faulkner, Senior Planner, Policy Planning and Special Programs, extension 8733  
Carly Murphy, Planner 1, Policy Planning and Special Programs, extension 8630

## **Approved by**



Haiqing Xu, Deputy City Manager,  
Planning and Growth Management

## **Reviewed by**



Nick Spensieri, City Manager

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 2: The Foundation For Complete Communities			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	Definition	Urban Design	Please revise the definition of "Complete Community" to the following: Places such as mixed-use neighborhoods or other areas within cities, towns, and settlement areas that offer and support opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to conveniently access most of the necessities for daily living <b>within 15 minutes walking distance or without relying on vehicles</b> , including an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and public service facilities. Complete communities are age friendly, <b>walkable</b> and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.
2	Chapter 2 (General Comment)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Block 47 is not correctly identified in the updated mapping. It is currently shown as 'Designated Greenfield Area' but Vaughan Official Plan 2010 designates it as a 'Community Area'. Please update the map schedules accordingly.
3	Chapter 2 (General Comment)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that strong policy requiring local municipalities to implement Green Development Standards be added to Chapter 2 of the ROP.
4	Chapter 2 (Objective)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The three pillars of "Sustainability" are economic viability, environmental protection, and social equity. It is suggested that the word "fiscally" be removed from the Objective as it is limiting to the definition of "Sustainability".
5	2.1 (Objective)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please revise the Objective as it is too focused on being "fiscally sustainable". Managing growth in a "fiscally sustainable manner" is not our main or only objective.
6	2.2 (Table 1)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Table 1 is very helpful.
7	2.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider revising use of the term "agile", as it carries a lot of project management connotation. Also consider rephrasing from "regular review" to "proactive review".
8	2.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The intent of this policy is good. Please provide clarification whether monitoring infrastructure investments is the role of the local municipality, the role of the Region, or a coordinated effort between the local municipality and the Region.
9	2.2.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Understanding that Policy 2.2.5 pertains to Regional infrastructure, does it require thresholds for phasing (e.g. xx% build-out of intensification areas before freeing up Future Urban Areas)? Will local municipalities need to set thresholds? Otherwise, how do we set triggers before planning is underway for FUAs? Are such thresholds not required because of Policy 2.2.12?
10	2.2.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider including a point under this policy regarding sustainability or the protection of the natural system.
11	2.2.16	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Policy 2.2.16 is a re-numbering of Policy 4.5.2. Has this been monitored over the past 10 years to determine that it has been effective and can be implemented?
12	2.2 and 2.3	Development Planning	There needs to be a policy for infill developments in "complete communities" - infill developments need to contribute to/be compatible with the existing complete community or provide an opportunity to add uses that don't currently exist in the achievement of a complete community within the existing community.
13	2.3	Development Planning	There needs to be a policy that discourages infill residential developments from replacing/displacing uses that contribute to an existing complete community (i.e. local amenities, removal of woodlands) and impacts walkability to these destinations within the neighbourhood.
14	2.3	Development Planning	Policies for the achievement of Complete Communities should include a minimum local amenity space requirement to be provided within a walkable distance based on number of units/residents in a community.
15	2.3	Development Planning	Please consider more specific policy directions/language requiring municipalities to include policies in their respective official plans for achieving Complete Communities, including the requirement for a definition of Complete Communities that is consistent with York Region's definition for complete communities (with suggested revisions).
16	2.3	Urban Design	On Page 19, the graphic references 15-minute communities. Please clarify if it is 15 minutes by car, transit or walking. There is no reference to 15-minutes in the text. It is suggested that the definition on Page 18 be revised to: "Complete communities are designed as accessible, dense and walkable, where most amenities are <b>within 15 minutes walking distance.</b> "



# ATTACHMENT 1

17	2.3.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	City staff have been advised by Indigenous Peoples that they have an interest in Climate Change. Consider adding Indigenous Peoples to the list.
18	2.3.1	Development Planning	The section number 2.3.1 is used twice - page 18 and 23. This may cause confusion if referencing either section. Other section/policy numbers are also repeated in YROP. Please review and consider re-numbering.
19	2.3.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please reference the term "wellness" in this policy.
20	2.3.10	Development Planning	Please replace "shall" with "must".
21	2.3.11	Development Planning	Please consider the following policy revisions: "That retail, commercial, office, and institutional structures shall be <b>integrated in a compact form in mixed-use buildings, including multi-storey buildings, where required by a municipal official plan</b> , and be pedestrian oriented and transit supportive, <b>to achieve a complete community</b> "
22	2.3.11	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please define the term "mixed-use".
23	2.3.13	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Although there are policies promoting green development in the design of new communities, there is no specific policy directing municipalities to develop green standards for private development. Staff suggest the following policy: That local municipalities develop green development standards to support sustainable growth and development.
24	2.3.13 d.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please include reference to "green infrastructure" in this policy.
25	2.3.13 i.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider the hierarchy of public spaces and relationships between these spaces in this policy.
26	2.3.13	Urban Design	Please revise sub-policy (a) to the following: "provide pedestrian scale, safety, security, comfort, <b>universal</b> accessibility and connectivity to promote physical activity, wellness and reduce auto dependency;"
27	2.3.14	Urban Design	Please revise sub-policy (c) to the following: "promote sustainable and attractive buildings that minimize energy use, reduce greenhouse gas emissions <b>and incorporate renewable energy sources;</b> "
28	2.3.14	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider requiring LEED certification for all new public buildings.
29	2.3.14	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This policy uses the term "accessible". Please define the term "accessible" in the ROP.
30	2.3.15	Urban Design	Please revise sub-policy (d) to the following: "promote landscaping including increasing tree canopy for shaded areas, <b>encouraging tree planting in unencumbered soil</b> and community greening to promote environmental sustainability;"
31	2.3.15	Economic and Cultural Development	Highspeed internet shall be recognized as servicing infrastructure for businesses alongside water and power.
32	2.3.15	Urban Design and Cultural Heritage	Please revise policy to add sub-policy (e): " <b>revitalizing and restoring existing buildings, including heritage resources; conserving existing cultural heritage landscapes</b> "
33	2.3.15	Economic and Cultural Development	There is an opportunity to include language around the shift to working from home in the future in Policy 2.3.15.
34	2.3.15	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider directing this policy to the Region as well as local municipalities. These are all valuable statements (for example, with respect to arterial roads).
35	2.3.16	Urban Design	Please revise sub-policy (e) to the following: "provide public spaces and attractive streetscapes that encourage active transportation, and improve safety <b>for all modes of travel;</b> "
36	2.3.18	Infrastructure Planning & Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that this policy be expanded beyond "... require the provision of facilities to encourage an increase in the mode share of cycling trips...", to instead require the provision of appropriate facilities to encourage an increase in the mode share of active transportation trips, such as covered and secure storage areas, shower and change facilities, in-boulevard short-term parking, and others.
37	2.3.18	VMC Program	This policy suggests the use of conditions of development approval which means it's a requirement. In this sense, the word encourage should be replaced with "shall be provided". Alternatively, the use of conditions of approval should be removed if "encourage" is the intent of this policy.

# ATTACHMENT 1

38	2.3.19 a.	Infrastructure Planning & Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	To emphasize the importance of limiting parking supply in order to achieve the objectives of transit-oriented development, prioritize active transportation, and address climate change, it is suggested that the policy be changed from "Reduced minimum and maximum parking requirements..." to "Minimized parking requirements and potentially no minimum parking requirements, consistent with distance to transit and complementary uses".
39	2.3.19	Policy Planning and Special Programs	As a part of 2.3.19, please include a policy that references on-street parking.
40	2.3.1.5	Development Planning	Please clarify how "Community Energy Plans" will be implemented with respect to development proposals through the planning application process.
41	2.3.1.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	2.3.1.6 currently reads, "2.3.1.6 To encourage local municipalities, agencies, and stakeholders to integrate climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies into municipal, planning and development tools including but not limited to pilot programs, bylaws, development guidelines and incentive programs." It is recommended that the wording be change from "encourage" to "require", as climate change is a critical priority.
42	2.3.1.13 b.	Infrastructure Planning & Corporate Asset Management	It is suggested that under sub-policy (b) of 2.3.1.13 that "increased precipitation" be changed to "projected precipitation".
43	2.3.1.13	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider including references to Low Impact Developments, green infrastructure, and naturalized areas, including those with native grasses, that have deep root systems and protect against erosion to support this policy.
44	2.3.1.16 h.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please add "embodied carbon" to this policy.
45	2.3.2	Development Planning	Types of dwelling units within "Multi-Residential" buildings and developments needs to be defined more clearly with respect to achieving an appropriate mix of "housing options" that considers families and various life stages, etc.
46	2.3.2.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Developing the necessary strategies and incentives to achieve these policies, yielding a greater mix of affordable housing opportunities, as implemented at the local level, remains challenging.
47	2.3.2.4 and Table 2	Development Planning	Tracking and encouraging new purpose-built rental units can be difficult without policies in the YROP that establish specific minimum requirements or incentives that can be referenced/relied upon by municipalities when evaluating development proposals.
48	2.3.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Given the barriers to the financing and construction of purpose built rental buildings, achieving the targets identified in Table 2 will be challenging. Limited production of purpose-built rental units and minimal uptake of existing incentives (ex. Regional DC deferral) within the last 10 years, indicate current development trends will not meet the proposed targets. Continued work through the YRLMHWG is required to develop the strategies and incentives to increase production of purpose-built rental developments.
49	2.3.2.6	Development Planning	Please define "Inclusionary Zoning".
50	2.3.2.7	Policy Planning and Special Programs	A definition of affordable ownership that does not differentiate between dwelling types, significantly impacts the affordable ownership threshold calculation due to the gap between the value of single detached dwellings and condominium units. An affordable ownership threshold that is too low, often results in few/limited market units meeting the threshold. If possible, within the parameters of the Provincial definition as applied to the regional market area, consider a threshold for both high density and ground related dwelling types.
51	2.3.3.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider adding "where appropriate" to the end of this policy.
52	2.3.3.10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Policy 2.3.3.10 reads, "To encourage retrofitting, intensification and revitalization, in accordance with policy 2.3.13, when redeveloping existing retail, including major retail sites." Please consider using wording that implies that this is a 'shall' statement rather than 'encourage'.
53	2.3.5.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This policy was formerly policy 4.1.5. Policy 4.1.5 included important points that have not been incorporated into the policy update. Please consider the inclusion of old points from former policy 4.1.5.
54	2.4 (General Comment)	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	There needs to be a data sharing agreement with the Province. Local municipal staff need to be able to review reports in order to provide meaningful engagement.
55	2.4.1.1 a.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please add the following policy under 2.4.1.1. a: "iii) To contact and inform First Nation or Metis regarding the proposed archaeological assessments."  Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation has advised the City that they would like to be engaged early on in the process.

# ATTACHMENT 1

56	2.4.1.1 c.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. c. from: "...during a Stage 2..." to "...during a <b>Stage 1 or 2</b> ..."
57	2.4.1.1. c.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Suggest using stronger language such as "recommend" rather than "encourage".
58	2.4.1.1. c.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. c. from: "...and in whose traditional territories..." to "...and in whose <b>treaty rights</b> to traditional territories...". Please note that we have been advised through our engagement with Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation that there is a difference between Treaty Rights vs. Interest Holders therefore this should be acknowledged in the preamble and subsequent policies.
59	2.4.1.1. d.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. d. from: "...during a Stage 2..." to "...during a <b>Stage 1 or 2</b> ..."
60	2.4.1.1. d.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. d. to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders
61	2.4.1.1. e.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. e. to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders
62	2.4.1.1.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	A policy should be added regarding Stage 4 - Mitigation. Secondly, Local Municipalities should be informed when a Stage 4 is required.
63	2.4.1.1. f.	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. f. from: "...a copy of the Provincial letters..." to "... <b>a copy of reports and the Provincial letters</b> ..."
64	2.4.1.2	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Revise policy 2.4.1.2 from: "...to residents in development proposals through innovative..." to "...to <b>community members within project vicinity through</b> innovative..."
65	2.4.1.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Policy 2.4.1.6 states "to work in partnership with Indigenous communities, local municipalities and stakeholders to review the York Region Archaeological Management Plan <b>on the same review schedule as this Plan</b> to ensure that archaeological resources information is kept up-to date." Can the Region please clarify if this policy is being implemented currently?
66	2.4.1.7	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Please clarify the intent of this policy.
67	2.4.1.7	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Revise policy 2.4.1.7 from: "New development....in this plan." to "New development and site alteration applications shall be screened for archaeological potential by using York Region's Archaeological Management Plan and Archaeological Potential Mapping or equivalent local mapping."
68	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Please clarify if it is the role of York Region or the local municipalities to develop an Indigenous Engagement Framework in conjunction with Indigenous Peoples
69	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Revise policy 2.4.1.8 " to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders
70	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning	Revise policy 2.4.1.8 from: "...an Indigenous engagement framework, which will provide..." to "...an Indigenous engagement framework <b>or equivalent strategy</b> , which will provide..."
71	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Suggest adding "Treaty rights" and traditional territories. We have been advised there is a difference and should be acknowledged accordingly.
72	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	In addition to creating principles, suggest adding the creation of protocols/standards.
73	2.4.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Suggest adding archaeological and cultural heritage of York Region. In the other sections you archaeology is specified - this should be specified within this policy too, or changed to "Cultural Heritage Resources" as per ROP definition.
74	2.4.2	Cultural Heritage	Please revise policy to the following: To promote well-designed built form and cultural planning, and to conserve features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.
75	2.4.2	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please revise "...and cultural planning..." to "...and cultural <b>heritage</b> planning..."
76	2.4.4	Cultural Heritage	Please revise policy 2.4.4 to the following: To require that cultural heritage resources within secondary plan study areas be identified, and significant resources shall be conserved.
77	2.4.8	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Consider replacing "are" with " <b>shall</b> be evaluated and conserved".
78	2.4.10	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please define "Core Historic Areas" in the ROP.
79	2.4.11	Urban Design and Cultural Heritage	Please revise policy 2.4.11 to the following: To encourage access to core historic areas by walking, cycling and transit, and to ensure that the design of the roads, vehicular access and parking reflects and complements the historic character of the area.

# ATTACHMENT 1

80	2.4.12	Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	This policy appears to be out of place. Consider integrating it in a more appropriate section (i.e. where other policies that support fine arts and community engagement are).
81	2.5	Infrastructure Planning & Corporate Asset Management	Please consider adding a clause around invasive species management. The movement of construction soils accelerates the movement of invasive species (their seeds reside in soils which spread when soils are moved, and the farther soils move the farther invasive species spread). Invasive species in Toronto's ravines is a big issue and past construction projects have unknowingly accelerated the spread of new species. Maybe this isn't an issue in Vaughan yet, but if it is, maybe there should be a goal to limit soil movements from areas with levels of invasive species being present.
82	2.5 (General Comment)	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Please provide clarity regarding how the regulation of managing excess soil would be implemented. Staff would like to understand how other local municipalities in the Region would implement this policy.
83	2.5 (General Comment)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Indigenous Peoples have stated that they want to be engaged earlier, in Stage 1, but the policies currently state Stage 2.
84	2.5.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Revise the language of policy 2.5.1 from "...reuse strategies as part of..." to "...reuse strategies <b>and/or guidance document</b> as part of...". Please note that City staff are not proposing that local municipalities develop reuse strategies, as stated in the policy.
85	2.5.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	York Region needs to coordinate and lead this work as the Region will have access to the entire Region's inventory of sites and Regional support would be required to coordinate with neighbouring municipalities.
86	2.5.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Staff do not support this policy. York Region should develop the excess reuse strategy as this is a cross jurisdictional issue. The strategy can later be implemented by local municipalities as Engineering Standards. Staff would like to understand how other local municipalities see this regulation being implemented. Therefore, having the Region lead this initiative will assist local municipalities.
87	2.5.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Currently, the City does not regulate the management of excess soils. Please revise the language in policy 2.5.2 from "...to <b>ensure</b> that..." to "...to <b>encourage that at a minimum...</b> ".
88	2.5.2 d.	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Please revise the language in policy 2.5.2.d. from "...the natural environment, and..." to "...the natural heritage and hydrological features, and...".
89	2.5.2 e.	Policy Planning and Special Programs/ Development Engineering	Please clarify why this policy is necessary as cultural heritage sites are protected as per the Heritage Act.
90	3.3 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify why policies supporting human services were removed.
91	3.1 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify why former policies supporting human health and wellbeing were removed, such as policies referencing climate change and light pollution.
92	3.2 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify why former policies supporting clean air have been deleted. It is suggested that they be included in the new YROP.
93	3.5.5 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The Secondary Plan, specifically Affordable Housing Strategy requirement may remain useful if fully connected to a broader City-wide or Regional Affordable Housing Strategy. Greater analysis with regard to implementation is required. Draft YROP 2.3.2.6 e) provides for a similar opportunity.
94	3.5.12 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	HYI remains the primary provider/manager of affordable non-market housing in many municipalities. This policy could be retained with additional language encouraging further collaboration between HYI and Local Municipalities (secondary plan development, land identification, community benefits, etc.).
95	3.5.18 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This policy remains relevant in a greenfield context (ex. Policy to encourage roughing-in second units). It is suggested that this policy be kept in the updated ROP.
96	5.2.26 and 5.2.28 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that these policies remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why these policies were removed.

# ATTACHMENT 1

97	5.2 policies (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.
98	3.5.(Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.
99	3.5.24 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.
100	4.1.1 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.
101	4.1.7 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.
102	4.1.15 (Existing YROP - Proposed deletion)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 3: A Sustainable Natural Environment			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	3.0 - Sustainable Natural Environment Goal	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that "to citizens" be added to the end of the sentence so that the goal reads: "Sustainable Natural Environment Goal: To protect, restore, and enhance the natural environment for current and future generations so that it will sustain life, maintain health, safeguard from natural hazards and provide a high quality of life to citizens."
2	3.1.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Our experience has been that policies for enhancement and linkage are not effective. Is the Region aware of any best practices or precedents that can be shared with local municipalities? Enhancement can also be interpreted to mean improvement of existing NHS areas. It should be clear if the intent is to identify enhancement areas that add to the natural heritage system.
3	3.1.7	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please review and clarify if the terminology should be "features" or "systems" in this policy.
4	3.2.3 and 3.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The requirement for scope and content of an EIS to be determined through a pre-consultation meeting is useful. Is there precedent or best practice to augment this policy to assist in determining a 'complete' application based on content and scope? Submissions in support of an application can be deemed 'complete', but still lack key details or even ignore important policy interpretation that would otherwise have to be addressed through the review process and often result in several submissions and circulations.
5	3.2.5 and 3.2.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider adding a 'shall' policy that provides habitat compensation for instances when Regional infrastructure impacts the natural heritage system, particularly when the loss of key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features cannot be avoided.
6	3.2.5 (c)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Remove community garden reference, as this would be quite onerous for City staff and non-profit organizations developing urban agriculture in the City. Community gardens are not designed where there are natural features. There are criteria for the selection of a site. Having to hire a consultant to conduct an EIS would be onerous and discourage public agencies. Please provide clarification as to why this reference is included. It is staff's understanding that there are many issues with private landowners encroaching onto natural heritage lands to extend their private vegetable gardens.
7	3.3.1.2	Planning Policy and Special Programs	Please clarify why this policy only pertains to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, since it is applicable city-wide.
8	3.3.1.4	Planning Policy and Environmental Sustainability	It is suggested that the Aquifer Vulnerability policies be reviewed in the context of ORCMP and Source Protection Plan. Coordination is needed on this matter. It is suggested that a technical document or handout be prepared for municipal staff.
9	3.3.8 to 3.3.11	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that Source Protection Plan polices be moved to Chapter 6. The SPP policies should be grouped together.
10	3.3.11	Policy Planning and Special Programs	A challenge for staff is confirming that a proposed building is required for "agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses or on-farm diversified uses". Is the Region aware of any tests to assist in the confirmation of the permitted uses? There have been examples in Vaughan of buildings claiming to be used for agriculture and then are used for a non-permitted use once built.
11	3.3.11	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that the agriculture policies be moved to Chapter 5.
12	3.4.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Similar to the comment for Policy 3.3.11, better tests are needed to verify an agricultural use.
13	3.4.5 a.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that under sub-policy (a) of 3.4.5, to add Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE) or equivalent technical study after EIS. Please note that if lands are in Provincial Plan areas, then an NHE is needed. There are different standards that need to be included in the review.
14	3.4.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The policy language that the content and scope of an EIS be identified at the PAC can assist with the determination of a complete application. It is suggested that this policy be strengthened to reference that the decision about a complete application can have reference to the scope of work and not just a submission document (i.e. relate to the quality and content of the submission).
15	3.4.10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider moving this policy to Chapter 5.
16	3.4.10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The term "minimum vegetation protection zone" has not been used in the ROP prior to this policy. Please check other policies to remain consistent with the terminology.

# ATTACHMENT 1

17	Table 3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This table provides visual clarity on the VPZs which is great. However, for significant valleylands, permanent and intermittent streams and seepage areas/springs, the minimum would still be 10 meters. There may be instances where this can be interpreted to be below the 10 meters. Please provide clarification.
18	Table 3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider replacing the term "buffer" unless it is used by other local municipalities. We should all be consistent.
19	3.4.18	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify why this policy only pertains to lands on the Oak Ridges Moraine.
20	3.4.28	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that a policy be added, encouraging municipalities to develop their own woodland compensation plan using York Region's principles.
21	3.4.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider adding, "and local municipalities" to the end of the policy.
22	3.4.2.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider setting more inclusive thresholds for significance in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). The threshold of 4 hectares for significant woodlands in the Countryside Designation means that woodlands will be lost in the ORMCP, as has already occurred even though the City of Vaughan has only 11-12% woodland cover. It is to be noted that the ORMCP Technical Paper for significant woodlands does not appear to provide the opportunity for more inclusive thresholds of significance.
23	3.4.2.7	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is recommended that the tests be made harder for this policy, or that the policy be deleted and focus on restoring woodlands that meet a certain size threshold, but may be of a lower quality due to invasive species or other matters. In some instances, larger woodlands are being described by consultants working for applicants as degraded or not meeting tests of a woodland.
24	3.4.3.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Suggest being more specific and identifying a "Landform Conservation Plan" is required. Can the Region please provide an example of this study.
25	3.5.7	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management	Please consider rewording this policy. While conservation authorities have a mandate related to the management of floodplain areas, isn't it Vaughan that it responsible for setting and updating Special Policy Areas rather than the CAs? In other words, please consider providing an additional policy with the intent that, "It is the policy of Council to support local municipalities in the setting and updating of Special Policy Areas..."
26	Woodlands Definition	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is recommended that the reference to stem density for the definition of woodlands be deleted. Please refer to the PPS, ORMCP Technical Paper series and Ecological Land Classification for guidance on how to define woodlands so that the definition is not used to remove woodlands. We need to recognize that most remaining woodlands are fragmented and impacted by invasives and edge effects. Hence, the focus should be on restoration.

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 4: An Urbanizing Region			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	Chapter 4 (General Comment)	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please ensure that community policies make room for employment areas that are not captured in the Regional Official Plan (i.e. converted areas that local municipalities may want to keep as employment areas).
2	4.1.2	Development Planning	There is potentially a conflict between Maps 1A and 1B. If so, which prevails?
3	4.1.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The role of MTSAs in the hierarchy proposed in the first bullet of the policy should be examined further. There is considerable overlap between MTSAs and other SGAs in the policy. A concern is that they will ultimately evolve into an overlapping continuum. Municipalities build communities based on logical planning units potentially composed of some or all of these elements. Local municipalities will benefit from flexibility to provide an appropriate naming protocol.
4	4.1.3 b.	Development Planning	Please consider making reference to 'local municipal official plans' in this policy.
5	4.2.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify how this policy will be measured and implemented. It will be important to ensure that all the supporting elements identified in 4.2.1 are planned for and tracked to ensure that they are appropriate to the mix of housing types they are supporting.
6	4.2.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify what will constitute a majority and how it will be determined. Consider removing the reference to "majority of" in this policy.
7	4.2.1.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify who would prepare the subwatershed plan or equivalent comprehensive planning study and what would be considered an acceptable equivalent comprehensive planning study.
8	4.2.1.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider clarifying that local municipalities will define the community core areas referred to in 4.2.1.4.
9	4.2.1.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Although a distinctive core is desired, it is also desirable for the entire New Community Area to be "vibrant, mixed use and walkable" and include the qualities listed in 4.2.1.4 a) - g).
10	4.2.1.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is vital to have a core that accommodates higher order services. This should be established through retail studies undertaken through the secondary planning process.
11	4.2.1.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify the intent of this policy. Fundamentally, in community areas, the number of jobs is generated by the projected population, (e.g. retail, services, schools). Please clarify if the intent is to draw employment uses from "Employment Areas" or to catch overlapping uses coming out of other structural elements.
12	4.2.1.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This is a good policy to support the integration of energy into land use planning. However, the Region should set minimum requirements for local municipal community energy plans. Municipal-wide energy plans tend not to have specific targets and it is difficult to translate from the MEPs to specific developments. For example, if MEPs include recommendations to build better than the OBC for new construction, then it will simply be interpreted as guidance and not applicable OP policy.
13	4.2.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider redefining "active transportation" to distinguish between bike paths and walking paths. Shared use active transportation paths are not effective.
14	4.2.1.12	Development Planning	Please provide clarification on the policy - How can you have a minimum density of 65 residents and jobs per ha and 18 residential units per ha? Do they have to achieve both? How many residents are in a unit?
15	4.2.1.17	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please define terms such as "Active Transportation Systems", "Community Mobility Systems" etc. within this policy.
16	Table 4	Development Planning	Please clarify "People and Jobs per hectare" in Table 4.
17	4.2.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The Land Needs Assessment report identified a lack of housing options for families, and that this trend is contributing to slower growth in York Region. Will there be any advancement of policies that encourage or mandate larger unit sizes to attract families? This would be helpful in SGAs, where significant growth is planned and there is not much range or mix of housing types.
18	4.2.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider removing 'zoning by-laws' as a requirement in this policy. This policy is more suited to be implemented at a local municipal official plan level. It might be better as a broader statement in the Implementation section of the ROP.
19	4.2.2.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify if this policy allows a local municipality to specify a subwatershed study supported by an MESP as the comprehensive plan.



# ATTACHMENT 1

20	4.2.2.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify the need for the explicit reference of "entire New Community Areas".
21	4.2.2.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	<p>Please clarify the meaning of an "alternative study" in this policy. In particular: "That local municipal concept plans or alternative comprehensive studies for each new community area shall form the basis for more detailed secondary plans at the block level." This makes sense if you substitute "block plan" for "secondary plan". This would reflect our current system. New Communities require secondary plans. By mentioning a secondary plan in this policy indicates that the Region intends it to be a statutory OP amendment to a secondary plan that has already been prepared. The Block Plan would not constitute an OPA.</p> <p>It ultimately may be better if the work identified in this section combine all these elements into a combined Secondary Plan/Block Plan exercise. The local municipalities should have this option. This is worth discussing with the local municipalities as a means of speeding up the process.</p>
22	4.2.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is difficult to see how this policy works, it needs to be reconsidered.(i.e. Secondary Plan approval should be contingent on provision of local infrastructure, and availability of local municipal services). The Region should make a schematic and work flow diagram to show how the Region's proposed system works.
23	4.2.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify why the supply of designated land is now 15 years in the ROP and why the 5 year supply of units with servicing capacity is now 5 years.
24	4.2.4	Development Planning	Please clarify what is considered as "compatible employment uses".
25	4.2.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Only residentially supporting and compatible employment uses should be provided for in the Community Area. This policy should be reviewed to ensure that it does not open the door to non-residential supporting and incompatible uses. Office buildings may be permitted in areas where the SGAs overlay a Community Area.
26	4.2.4	VMC Program	Please define the word "balanced" and provide clarity as to how "balance" is measured.
27	4.2.5	VMC Program	This policy should clarify that live-work (within residential units, home offices) do not make up for or substitute employment uses nor would it contribute to employment targets.
28	4.2.6	VMC Program	Please consider adding policy language that requires reference and compliance to D-Series Guidelines.
29	Table 4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Assuming that the density targets expressed in the policy are in people and jobs per hectare, what are the implications for Blocks 27 and 41 in Vaughan? This is likely not a concern for Block 27, however, Block 41 has specific Council direction for a reduced density target. Please provide further clarification.
30	4.2.7	Development Planning	Local municipalities shall plan to meet or exceed the designated greenfield area minimum however, there is no map associated with the location of the designated greenfield area. Designated greenfield areas are defined as outside of the built-up area in the 2006 Growth Plan. Mapping should be provided to provide clarity and ensure that the local municipality is accurately providing the density target.
31	4.3 (General Comment)	Economic and Cultural Development	Please consider the opportunity to identify main streets as employment areas within this section of the ROP. We have faced challenges in the past to get resources for mainstreets because they lacked such designation.
32	4.3.10	Development Planning	Please define "Megazones" instead of creating a text insert. This appears to form part of Policy 4.3.10.
33	4.3.12	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider reframing this policy to simply require local municipalities to create hierarchies of employment uses.
34	Table 5	Development Planning	Please clarify "Jobs per hectare" in Table 5.
35	4.3.14	Economic and Cultural Development	This policy may contradict the encouragement of developing mixed-use areas. With work from home/15min city concepts, more and more people will live, work, play in the same zone.
36	4.3.15 & 4.3.17	Policy Planning and Special Programs	<p>Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.7.b should be left at the discretion of the Region, in consultation with local municipalities. Major retail in the supporting employment area would constitute a conversion and affect the Region's employment mapping.</p> <p>It may also create a variety of standards, whereas a regional approach would provide consistency. Alternatively, the ROP could potentially provide guidelines for local municipal policies.</p> <p>Lastly, the municipalities are doing their own retail studies, which should identify the City's retail needs.</p>

# ATTACHMENT 1

37	4.3.17	Economic and Cultural Development	It is important to consider that major retail nodes may be less and less important as main streets revive.
38	4.3.22	Policy Planning and Special Programs	New employment areas should require a secondary plan, not Alternative/Equivalent Comprehensive Studies. Please consider revising this policy.
39	4.3.22	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please provide clarification regarding whether the Secondary Plan is a further Official Plan Amendment or through a Block Plan.
40	4.3.24	VMC Program	Strategic growth areas, e.g. Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC), is often taken out of or not included as a part of designated employment areas. While in the Secondary plan level we designate certain land for employment uses, Cities are often facing market challenges for employment uses. It would be helpful if the Region could strengthen policy language to bolster secondary plan requirements for employment uses since they do not fall within the employment area and are not required to contribute to the minimum density targets.
41	4.4.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is recommended that this policy be removed as it reads as an override of all the following policies. This policy may be problematic if the applicant does not feel we are maximizing development potential.
42	4.4.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Strategic Growth Areas is a broad category. There are urban centres and some MTSAs that fit this definition, while other MTSAs do not. Please consider that this may more appropriately address Centres.
43	4.4.4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	MTSAs and other Provincial designations do not necessarily need to be an explicit part of the hierarchy, as such, please consider revising. One approach is to make the categories of the hierarchy more distinct.
44	4.4.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify the meaning of a 'comprehensive plan', as referred to in 4.4.5.
45	4.4.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider referencing the term "hierarchy" to be clearer about what this context means.
46	4.4.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify the intent of this policy.
47	4.4.8	VMC Program	Further emphasis and clarity with respect to variety of dwelling unit sizes should be considered, i.e. minimum percentage of unit types and respective minimum sizes.
48	4.4.10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please define the term "comprehensive planning study". Please consider replacing this term if it cannot be defined.
49	4.4.11 d)	Development Planning	The term "gentle density" is subjective. Please consider using another term.
50	4.4.11	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Generally, dense areas cannot have suburban amenities. Please reconsider how the tools match the intent of the policy.
51	4.4.11 a. & 4.4.12	VMC Program	In Vaughan and especially within the VMC, meeting and exceeding intensification targets isn't an issue. The problem at hand is over-exceeding and having sufficient infrastructure to support overdevelopment. Policy 4.4.12 speaks to local municipalities identifying maximums. Consider connecting this policy with 4.4.11 a.
52	4.4.11 e. & 4.4.30	VMC Program	Recognizing that affordable housing is governed at the upper tier level, through development applications, we have not seen any active approaches from the Regional level to require affordable housing through S.37 contributions. Please consider adding some policy language to require affordable housing through the review of development applications at the Region level, including criteria which affordable housing would be required, ownership models, etc.
53	4.4.14	VMC Program	It would be difficult to mandate public facilities within Regional Centres and along corridors. For example, Vaughan City Hall and Vaughan's new hospital are both located outside of the VMC and not along Highway 7. We cannot change the location of these facilities without a huge financial burden and local Council would need to make the decision on this. In addition, certain EMS services like hospitals are provided by the province, who are not required to go through planning processes. In this regard, it would be difficult to meet / enforce this policy. The policy language needs to be softened to consider existing conditions or use language such as "highly encourage".
54	4.4.16	Development Planning	The term "missing middle" is vague - does this only include medium density development? What about more intense forms of low rise development?
55	4.4.16	VMC Program	Please clarify how the Region would be able to assist local municipalities to enforce requiring missing middles to be incorporated into development.
56	4.4.16	VMC Program	Clarification is needed for this policy on how it could be implemented. Is the intent of this policy to require all levels of Council to work with lower tier municipalities to ensure that policies in local documents consider gentle intensification and a mix of housing options?

# ATTACHMENT 1

57	4.4.16	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider revising the policy to avoid using the term "missing middle".
58	4.4.17	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Planners cannot give a professional opinion on gentle density. Consider using terminology such as "compatibility".
59	4.4.18	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify the meaning of "cyclist-friendly". Please consider strengthening and clarifying, indicating how we can better promote dedicated cycling infrastructure.
60	4.4.19	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Urban design is typically the responsibility of local municipalities. Please clarify the intent of this policy.
61	4.4.21 f	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This is a good policy. Please ensure this policy is also applied to regional roads.
62	4.4.27	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This policy is logical. However, we should ensure that this policy is not used to accelerate urban area expansion by claiming that there are delays in build-out in intensification areas.
63	4.4.27	Policy Planning and Special Programs	These areas need to be prioritized and the current proposed policy would seem to complicate and delay their delivery. "The approval of the Secondary Plan be <b>"contingent on"</b> the availability of infrastructure and other services" does not seem desirable as it will become a mechanism that will further delay our process. Please consider revising this policy.
64	4.4.27	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Infrastructure needs are determined through a Secondary Plan. It is the policy of a Secondary Plan and the Phasing Plan that the delivery of services be provided. It may be more efficient to make approval of development contingent on the confirmation of the availability of infrastructure (e.g. planned and funded by way of DCs). Please consider revising.
65	4.4.27	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The Infrastructure and phasing are what provide for delivery of those services. York Region Master Plans should be identifying these deficiencies.
66	4.4.29	VMC Program	This policy could be problematic if local municipalities were shifting density permissions within a Secondary Plan area. Densities and associated developments need to be reviewed in context of the area, not in isolation. It is recommended that this policy be deleted or revised to allow the decision to be on the local municipality, depending on the circumstances and without the need for an MCR.
67	4.4.29	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This could be used as a means to limit the mix of housing. It makes it implies that every site in an SGA must meet the minimum target, when the target is actually applied across the SGA/MTSA, rather than a site by site basis. Please consider revising.
68	4.4.36	VMC Program	Please add "range of unit sizes and housing and tenure options".
69	4.4.41	VMC Program	We understand that the Region is designating all MTSAs as Protected MTSAs. Should all MTSA references be prefaced with and distinguished as "Protected"?
70	4.4.2.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify if the "official plan and other implementation documents" referred to in policy 4.4.2.9 includes secondary plans or alternative development studies.
71	4.4.2.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider revising the terminology in this policy as it appears to be inconsistent with other terminology used throughout the ROP.
72	4.4.2.9 d.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider splitting this into two separate sub-policies (i.e. one on mixed-use pedestrian environments and one on retaining employment).
73	4.4.2.9 f.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Consider adding at the end "and integrated into development in a manner consistent with the prevailing urban design criteria."
74	4.4.2.10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider referring to the MTSAs in this policy as "future MTSAs" to provide clarity.
75	4.4.3.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider revising this policy with an alternative term for the "missing middle".

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 5: Supporting the Agricultural System			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	5.1.3	Policy Planning and Special Programs	In Vaughan there are prime agricultural areas (as per the OMAFRA mapping) outside of the Greenbelt and ORMCP areas. Are there policies that support these areas, or are they all being identified as urban expansion areas? Please clarify.
2	5.1.6	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that "and promote Environmental Farm Plans" be added to this policy.
3	5.1.7	Development Planning	Suggest specifying what the permitted non-agricultural uses are.
4	5.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Is the Region reviewing Agricultural Impact Assessments? Through the current process, City staff have not been relying on Regional staff for agricultural review of AIAs. Please provide clarification so we can update processes. Also, the policy should also include municipalities as approval authority.
5	5.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify if this policy only pertains to Regional projects.
6	5.1.9 b.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please add "and policies" to the end of sub-policy (b) of policy 5.1.9.
7	5.1.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider adding a sub-policy (f) to address Agricultural Impact Assessment requirements.
8	5.1.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please considering adding "at a minimum" after "addressing the following elements".
9	5.1.9 e.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Sub-policy (e) (iii) only focuses on Regional Greenlands System, however, there may be natural heritage features outside the Regional Greenlands System. Please consider including these in the policy to ensure that they are protected.
10	5.1.12	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please confirm that the term Agricultural "System" should be used instead of "Area".
11	5.1.16	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider identifying the requirements for Source Protection Plans in this policy.
12	5.1.20	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please provide a definition for 'urban agriculture'. Has vertical farming been considered? City of Vaughan has a definition that can be used. Clarification is needed if Vertical Farming is included in the definition of urban agriculture.
13	5.1.20	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Staff is supportive of this policy. It is suggested that "at a minimum" be added to the policy before the list of sub-policies.
14	5.2.5	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Staff is supportive of this policy; however Vaughan does not have requirements at this time. The permitted uses guidelines identify criteria for the development of the farm dwellings. Please consider these as a reference.
15	5.2.6 f.	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please clarify if 5.2.6 sub-policy (f) applies to farm help dwellings.
16	5.3.1 and 5.3.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Map 1A identifies rural areas designation for lands within the Greenbelt Plan and ORMCP. These lands are within the urban settlement area and are primarily natural heritage lands. Please provide rationale for redesignating the lands outside of the linear valleys of the Greenbelt Plan Area i.e. Kortright and ORM countryside.
17	5.3.1 and 5.3.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The preamble states "The Rural Area contains areas of environmental significance, including large portions of Natural Core Area and Natural Linkage Area of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.". Please clarify why only portions of the lands in eastern Vaughan (ORMCP) have been included, not others. This same comment applies to the lands in eastern Vaughan in the Green Belt as well.
18	5.3.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	This policy is overly permissive, particularly if the Region is contemplating expanding the Rural Area designation. The uses in sub-policy (a) may not be appropriate if we are acknowledging the NHS overlay of the Greenbelt Plan.
19	5.3.7 and 5.3.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is understood that the intent to limit the uses in the proposed Rural Area in the Greenbelt 'fingers', however, there is concern that the Rural designation will result in ongoing challenges of permitted uses. It is suggested that a 'Natural Areas' designation be added that allows for passive recreational uses, such as trails and community gardens. Alternatively, the Region could permit local municipalities to apply a more restrictive land use designation, such as Natural Areas, in order to ensure conformity with the more restrictive uses.

# ATTACHMENT 1

20	5.4.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please remove the Purpleville Hamlet (heritage properties) in the City of Vaughan from Map 1A. The heritage properties are no longer in the landscape as there was a fire. These were delisted in Spring 2020. The cemetery is the only remannet feature left.
21	5.4.2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	The Teston Hamlet located at the northeast corner of Teston Road and Jane Street has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape through the Block 27 Secondary Plan. Please refer to Block 27 Secondary Plan for more information. Please update Map 1A to designate the Teston Hamlet.
22	5.5.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	York Region staff provided us a link to the Provincial mapping, and the mapping does now show any active mineral aggregate sites in Vaughan.

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 6: Servicing Our Communities			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	General	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that the cross-section image be updated with in-boulevard cycling facilities, or otherwise removed to not indicate a preferred type of cycling facilities on rapid transit corridors.
2	6.1.2	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management	Please clarify/add policies to describe the Region's preferences regarding wastewater servicing. Please consider adding policies such as: "It is the policy of Council .... To first pursue wastewater contribution reductions through Inflow and Infiltration reduction and the promotion of efficient plumbing fixtures to minimize the amount of Regional wastewater servicing infrastructure that is required" and then, "It is the policy of Council .... To ensure that wastewater servicing capacity is forecasted and corresponding infrastructure upgrades are constructed to ensure that Regional wastewater servicing capacity does not become the limiting factor for population growth in member municipalities"
3	6.3.1	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that a new policy be added to 6.3.1 - "to work with local municipalities to determine the operation and maintenance responsibilities for the Regional Cycling Network and other cycling facilities within the Regional right-of-way."
4	6.3.1.4	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	This policy should also require cycling facilities in addition to sidewalks, streetlighting and street furniture.
5	6.3.1.6	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that this policy be made more general beyond "including pedestrian and cycling connections" to pedestrian and cycling supportive infrastructure. If this is appropriate, additional infrastructure listed could also include: dedicated short and long-term bicycle parking, shower and change facilities, bicycle wash stations, etc.
6	6.3.2.4 d.	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	Please consider also including MTSAs.
7	6.3.3	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	Suggest a new policy similar to policies 6.3.3.22 and 6.3.3.25, which states that the Region will identify funding partners for, and subject to identification of secured funding, will implement the Langstaff Road extension between Creditstone Road and Keele Street over the CN MacMillan Yard.
8	6.3.2.7	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that this policy should read "To require local municipalities to, subject to available funding:". Implementation should be premised on the availability of financial resources rather than a mandatory requirement from the Region.
9	6.3.3.16	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	Please note that Vaughan Council does not currently support implementation of the GTA West Corridor and therefore Council is unlikely to support official plan policies that provide corridor protection for this Corridor.
10	6.3.3.17 and 6.3.3.20	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	In principle, staff support these policies to provide finer grid street networks through the local municipality's collector and local street system. However, continuous networks are not always implementable in areas with significant natural heritage resources, heritage areas, etc. without substantial financial investment. Therefore, implementation should be premised on the availability of financial resources rather than a mandatory requirement from the Region.
11	6.3.3.21	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	Please note that Vaughan Council does not currently support implementation of the GTA West Corridor and therefore Council is unlikely to support official plan policies that provide corridor protection for this Corridor.
12	6.3.4	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is suggested that a new policy be inserted that says, "to work with local municipalities to identify existing areas adjacent to Regional roads with land uses which are sensitive to noise, vibration and safety issues, and discourage heavy truck traffic from using these segments of Regional roads."
13	6.4.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that a new subsection, 6.5 Source Protection, be created. Please consider combining the Source Protection policies in Chapter 2 into the new subsection as well.
14	6.4.23	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management	This is a good policy. However, this policy could be strengthened by revising the lanaguage slightly. For example, "That water and wastewater systems be sized to consider potential expansion of the service area, intensification, and increased servicing allocation from what is described in York Region Official Plans, York Region Master Plans, local municipal official plans and Provincial Plans".

# ATTACHMENT 1

15	6.5.6	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management	Please consider revising this policy from, "to ensure that they function as designed.", to, "to ensure that they function in accordance with the levels of service defined within municipal asset management plans."
16	6.5.7	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management	With the recent changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, a municipality doesn't have to use/work with a CA to develop master plans. A city could simply choose to hire a consultant to do this work instead. A CA does not have approval authority on master plans. In such processes they are a stakeholder no different than any other party. CA's hold power mostly only in the permitting part of the process, and even then only with their regulated boundaries. It is suggested that the wording of this policy be revised: "and the conservation authorities' be replaced with "and the conservation authorities, in accordance with the Conservation Authority Act, ...".

City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
Chapter 7: Implementation of the Official Plan			
Count	Chapter Subsection/ Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	The Region has not addressed Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation's request to include specific language into the ROP. Please advise if this is being considered, as staff would like to understand how to address in our Official Plan update. Direction would be appreciated.
2	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	It is suggested that Indigenous Relations and Engagement be identified as the title of this section. There should a separate public consultation component as residents and Indigenous Peoples should be engaged differently. Please update the objective accordingly.
3	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please consider adding Truth and Reconciliation Actions in the preamble and objective.
4	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please revise the preamble as it should differentiate between Treaty Rights holders vs. Interest holders.
5	7.1.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	It is suggested that the term "Indigenous Peoples" vs. "Indigenous Communities" be reviewed by the Region as there have been some recent legal decisions that may have identified Peoples as the preferred term.
6	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	It is suggested that a new policy be added to encourage local municipalities to develop in partnership with their Treaty Rights Holders, a Memorandum of Understanding and/or Friendship Agreement for future relationship building and partnerships between both parties. This would account for the following: economic development, cultural heritage, environment, archaeological and history.
7	7.1	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please clarify if the Region has considered leading the coordination of Indigenous Communities engagement for the lower tier municipalities.
8	7.1.4 and 7.1.5	Development Planning	York Region should take the leadership role on engagement to ensure that lower tier municipalities are consistent with their consulting protocols.
9	7.1.8	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	Please consider using a different term than "online methods".
10	7.1.9	Policy Planning and Special Programs/Development Planning (Cultural Heritage)	The policy as written has no basis for engagement with stakeholders, public or Indigenous Communities. It is suggested that the policy be revised to the following: "To advocate to senior levels of government for funding partnerships for economic development, environmental sustainability and cultural heritage matters with our Indigenous Communities."
11	7.2.2	Development Planning	Please clarify who will be responsible for the monitoring, and how densities will be allocated.
12	7.3.10 d. and e.	Development Planning	Reference is made that there is a requirement of at least 1 pre-application meeting (PAC). Please clarify if this would be the PAC of the local municipality, or of York Region.
13	7.3.11	Development Planning	Applicants may request a terms of reference for certain required planning studies i.e. Affordable Housing Contribution Plan. Can the Region make this available?
14	7.3.14	Development Planning	Please see policy: "That if approval of a draft plan of subdivision lapses, opportunities for achieving the growth management targets of this Plan shall be considered as part of the development review process." This statement is unclear. Please clarify if York Region is stating that they can pull their approvals if a subdivision lapses. Vaughan provides for an opportunity to extend approvals subject to the comments from internal and external agencies.
15	7.4.4 and 7.4.6	Development Planning	7.4.4 states that where a term is defined in the ORMCP, those definitions shall prevail over those contained in the Plan, however, this same statement is not identified for the Greenbelt Plan. Please revise 7.4.6 to be consistent.
16	7.4.14	Development Planning	This clause should also apply to the existing uses and residential dwellings on existing lots of record in the ORMCP.



City of Vaughan Comments on November 2021 Draft York Region Official Plan			
General Comments			
Count	Chapter Subsection/Policy Number	Commenter Department	Comment
1	Map 1C	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please add Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) Settlement Areas to the list in the legend and identify in Map 1C. It is assumed that the white 'shading' in the map represents the Settlement Area in the ORMCP.
2	Map 2	Policy Planning and Special Programs	It is suggested that the legend be renamed from "local municipal greenlands system" to "local natural heritage system". Please note that Vaughan does not use 'greenlands system' as a term in the Vaughan Official Plan.
3	Map 4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider changing the title of the map to "Water Resources System", as per the policies.
4	Map 4	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please change the blue layer to "Provincially Significant Wetlands". Please clarify by Provincial Plan Area Wetlands are identified.
5	Map 6, 7 and 12A	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please consider grouping together all maps that are environmentally related as it would be more reader-friendly.
6	Map 10	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	Please confirm whether commuter parking lot identified at Islington and Rutherford is correct.
7	Map 10	Policy Planning and Special Programs	As discussed with York Regional staff, we request stronger policy language on the Regional intensification hierarchy, particularly as it relates to the proposed BRT on Major MacKenzie Drive West, west of highway 400. We are happy to have further discussions and provide suggested policy language for incorporation in the updated draft YROP.
8	Map 11	Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management - Transportation Planning	It is unclear what process the Region has undertaken to determine "Other arterial street widths" and by extension, which of these roads will be considered for transfer to the Region subject to the Policies of Regional Council. We will note that Kirby Road between Bathurst Street (in the future) and Highway 27, as well as Pine Valley Drive between Teston Road and King-Vaughan Road may be candidates for transfer to the Region.
9	Map 12B	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please confirm that the ESGRA policies are part of the water resources system mapping, if so, it is suggested that they be grouped together with Map 4.
10	Map 12A	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Please add the downgradient line to the map.
11	Definitions	Development Planning	Definition of "Complete Community" - delete "such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas" - implies complete communities are limited to mixed-use neighbourhoods and "other areas" is not defined.
12	Definitions	Development Planning	"(Local) Amenities" needs to be defined in the context of achieving a Complete Community in terms of uses and location.
13	Appendix 2 - MTSA's	Development Planning	The number of the corresponding "Adjacent Major Transit Station Area" needs to be labeled on the MTSA maps. It is difficult to find the corresponding Adjacent MTSA since the maps are not in order.
14	Entire ROP	Development Planning	The text should be interactive, where terms or Map's are different colour & in italics, the reader should be able to click on them to take them to the definition or the map. The table of contents should also be interactive considering that the document is all electronic.
15	Definitions	Development Planning	New Community Areas are defined, however, they are lands that have been added to the Urban Area through a Regional MCR beyond those designated as Urban Area at the date of approval of this Plan. The maps are very small and a comparison from the old to the new MCR would be required.
16	Appendix 2 - MTSA's	Development Planning	A map showing each local municipality with the MTSA's would be helpful along with their number. The list and MTSA number is not visual or user-friendly.
17	Density targets and MTSA's	Development Planning	What is the base to use in calculating people and jobs per ha? The MTSA mapping shows density targets, however, it does not state whether those are minimums or maximums. Please identify on the mapping.

# ATTACHMENT 1

18	Maps	Development Planning	Is there any parcel fabric mapping that could help identify different designations? i.e. Appendix 1 Employment Area Zone and Density Map - The southwest corner of Highway 7 & Keele is identified as both Urban Area and Employment Area Zone. The owner could pick up additional land and claim that it is all Urban Area. Parcel mapping would help identify where the Urban Area ends and Employment Area Zone begins.
19	General	Policy Planning and Special Programs	Was the Indigenous Land Acknowledgment prepared in collaboration with the First Nations Peoples?