

**From:** IRENE FORD  
**Sent:** June 29, 2022 12:02 PM  
**To:** Regional Clerk <ClerkGeneralLine@york.ca>  
**Subject:** Rimizi Lands

---

Hello,

**Oppose Vaughan's settlement agreement or at least allow the public an opportunity to be consulted and explain why more residential development should be supported on the ORM?**

I would like to express my disappointment that York Region Council went into closed meeting to discuss a sensitive and controversial development in Vaughan on the ORM then came out and voted in the absence of any opportunity for the public to understand or be able to comment. It would very much appear that York Region by not objecting to the settlement agreement that Vaughan Council had agreed to is supporting a MZO on the ORM, just in a different form as a second Minister's Order to open up an additional 250Ha of land, above and beyond the approved 2015 Minister Order. The ORM, ANSI areas are not red tape nor can they be replaced in other areas it is the combination of physical and natural features that earns these types of areas this designation. That it is inconvenient for the landowner and precludes them from developing their land is not Vaughan or York Region Council's problem. Let it go to the tribunal and let the unqualified PC Party appointees take the heat for such reckless decisions.

On top of this York Region and Vaughan are systematically destroying this area by conducting piecemeal planning in silos. How many separate EA's does York Region and/or lower tier municipalities have ongoing in the same area in Vaughan on the Oak Ridges Moraine in an area that is considered an ANSI?

- 1) [York Region is conducting an EA to extend Teston.](#)
- 2) Vaughan conducted an EA to extend Kirby Rd from Dufferin to Bathurst
- 3) Staff Communication S2 is announcing completion of EA to widen Kirby Rd <https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=110554>
- 4) Jane St, from Teston to King Vaughan Rd requires an EA for expansion according to the [Block 27 staff report](#) that advanced w/w and some transportation infrastructure approved by York Region Council (refer to pg. 4 stating \$1M for EA)

Why are the EAs being conducted in such a piecemeal manner? Is this compliant with the provincial EAA? The City and York Region appear anything but transparent about their plans for this when EAs are conducted in this manner. Especially when the Kirby and Teston Rd extensions cross the ORM and on or near large ANSI areas. On top of this both York Region and Vaughan Council have had closed meeting about the controversial Rimzi developments stemming from a 2015 Minister's Order that to my understanding the landowner has been taken an overly generous interpretation. The same landowner who got caught conducting a [superficial EA](#) on the Vaughan's taxpayer dime and conspiring with the Ford government to open up more of the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Finding the Kirby Rd expansion added as a staff communication on Vaughan's agenda and not listed as a separate item only compounds the sentiment that there is no transparency or public accountability and the Vaughan Council is ruthlessly trying to develop ecologically sensitive

areas of the Oak Ridges Moraine. York Region is busy approving their draft 2051 Official Plan and making precedent setting decisions to expand the urban boundary into the countryside designation it's clear the City nor York Region care about cumulative impacts and protection within settlement areas or anywhere on the ORM, nor the hydrological significance that comes with this designation.

This area likely exemplifies (yes on/near a closed landfill but still ORM and ANSI) why Mayor Lovatt's motion at York Region should not be supported the development just continues to bleed and expand ever further if we have no hard boundaries and politicians who do not see the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine as off-limits, or refuse to acknowledge or who do not understand why the Greenbelt/ORM are integral to the health, quality of life as well as the protection and viability of farmland, source water and stormwater protection for of our existing and future communities, especially in a world faced with a changing climate it will always be open for development at the expense of these public goods.

Death by 1000 cuts to the Greenbelt and ORM ensues.

I cannot emphasize enough this isn't about NOT developing it's about where, how and whom development is being approved, advanced and prioritized for. It's about how private interests that clearly have vested pecuniary interests continue to be prioritized through member's motions or brought forward on staff agendas at both the lower and upper tier.

When our political leaders do not respect our legislation, by-laws and view them as red tape, fail to act in the public interest to protect or cultural and natural heritage, to advocate and act on outcomes that protect our most vulnerable who can not protect or speak for themselves, our future generations then it is wonder to me that young people are disengaged, that we are seeing such polarization in society and a general sentiment that the rules don't apply and don't need to be followed by anyone.

If out politicians do not follow the rules then why should anyone else?

Thank you,  
Irene Ford