



## Town of Aurora Council Public Planning Meeting Minutes

**Date:** Tuesday, June 14, 2022  
**Time:** 7 p.m.  
**Location:** Council Chambers, Aurora Town Hall

**Council Members:** Mayor Tom Mrakas (Chair)  
 Councillor Harold Kim (arrived 7:17 p.m.)  
 Councillor Wendy Gaertner\*  
 Councillor Sandra Humfries (arrived 7:20 p.m.)  
 Councillor Michael Thompson  
 Councillor John Gallo

**Members Absent:** Councillor Rachel Gilliland

**Other Attendees:** Marco Ramunno, Director of Planning and Development Services  
 Sean Lapenna, Planner  
 Rosanna Punit, Planner  
 Michael de Rond, Town Clerk  
 Linda Bottos, Council/Committee Coordinator

\*Attended electronically

### 1. Call to Order

The Mayor called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

Council consented to recess the meeting at 9:04 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Council consented to extend the hour past 10:30 p.m.

### 2. Land Acknowledgement

Mayor Mrakas acknowledged that the meeting took place on the Anishinaabe lands, the traditional and Treaty #20 territories of the Chippewas of Georgina

Island, recognizing the many other Nations whose presence here continues to this day and that Aurora has shared responsibility for the stewardship of this land. It was noted that Aurora is part of the treaty lands of the Mississaugas of the Credit, recognized through Treaty #13 and the Williams Treaties of 1923.

### 3. **Approval of the Agenda**

**Moved by** Councillor Thompson

**Seconded by** Councillor Gallo

That the agenda as circulated by Legislative Services be approved.

Yeas (4): Mayor Mrakas, Councillor Gaertner, Councillor Thompson, and Councillor Gallo

Absent (3): Councillor Kim, Councillor Humfries, and Councillor Gilliland

**Carried (4 to 0)**

### 4. **Declarations of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest under the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.50*.

### 5. **Planning Applications**

The Mayor outlined the procedures that would be followed in the conduct of the public meeting. The Town Clerk confirmed that the appropriate notice was given in accordance with the relevant provisions of the *Planning Act*.

#### 5.1 **PDS22-083 - Applications for Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision, Highfair Investments Inc., 5 to 70 Archerhill Court, Lots 1 to 14, Plan 65M-2494, File Numbers: ZBA-2021-06 and SUB-2021-02**

##### **Planning Staff**

Sean Lapenna, Planner, presented an overview of the staff report regarding the Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications, noting the applicant proposes to develop the subject lands to accommodate 145 single-detached dwellings, public streets and open space blocks, and to rezone the subject lands from "Estate Residential (ER) Zone" to "Detached Third Density Residential Exception Zone R3(XX)", "Detached Fourth Density Residential Zone (R4)", "Detached

Fourth Density Residential Exception Zone R4 (X1)", "Detached Fourth Density Residential Exception Zone R4 (X2)", "Public Open Space (O1) Zone" and "Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.

### **Applicant/Agent**

Angela Sciberras, Principal, Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd., noted she was accompanied by representatives of Highfair Investments Inc. (Treasure Hill Homes), and Sarah Kurtz, Senior Engineer, SCS Consulting Group Ltd. to answer engineering questions. Ms. Sciberras presented an overview of the proposed development including project timeline, policy context, built form and neighbourhood character, key issues raised by community, revised draft plan of subdivision, proposed zoning, density comparison, landscape master plan, conceptual elevations, key items, and next steps.

### **Public Comments**

Aurora residents, including J-P Bernier, Colin Deschamps, Paul Frisk, Frank Giorgio, John Green, Sabrina Greupner, Tim Jones, Stephane Perron, Klaus Wehrenberg, and Keith Wilson, expressed the following comments:

Concerns regarding:

- Density too high, unsustainable
- Incompatibility with area character, form and density
- Traffic flow and congestion
- Single access point on Vandorf Sideroad
- Traffic studies done during COVID-19 pandemic not realistic
- Emergency services access
- Window for review of application is too short for the public
- Environmental impacts of green space being removed and effect on aquifer currently exposed to environment
- Loss of nearby neighbourhood
- Lack of consultation with area residents
- Removal of mature trees (to be replaced with shrubs)
- Lack of respect for the Oak Ridges Moraine
- No plan for outflow of traffic from proposed subdivision
- Proximity of site access to intersection at Bayview Avenue and Vandorf Sideroad
- Lack of adequate public park space
- Stormwater runoff

- Proposal does not meet landform policies
- Existing watercourse, woodlands, buffer protection of 30 meters
- Wastewater, pumping; possible maintenance issues for homeowners and Town re proposed individual water pumps and sanitary sewer main with pumping station
- Environmental impacts, intrusion into natural areas to west, loss of green space

Suggestions regarding:

- Reduce the number of homes, increase lot sizes
- Main access should be on Bayview Avenue, with emergency access on Vandorf Sideroad
- Opportunity for public/charitable organizations to survey existing homes for reusable components prior to destruction
- Need additional access on Bayview Avenue or Vandorf Sideroad
- Should have full access onto Bayview Avenue
- Need compromise between developer and community
- Urge developer to consult with surrounding area homeowners
- Possibility of protected species on site should be investigated
- Buffers and setbacks should be maximum in relation to added light impact on existing wildlife
- Cluster residential units to accommodate higher density, more green space, more affordable units, and trail access away from regional roads
- Apply Green Development Standards, such as solar panels on roofs of all homes
- Require establishment of a local commercial area to satisfy some shopping needs, to minimize number of vehicle trips
- Accommodate non-vehicular traffic by establishing direct connections from the proposed subdivision to safe walking and cycling routes

Questions regarding:

- Compensation/management plan for multiple years of major disruption including construction vehicle parking, noise and inconvenience
- Plan with specific environmental steps to address protection of existing flora and fauna, water runoff, reflected heat from shingles
- Location of real green space

- Water line to supply water to new development (Falconwood Estates water pressure already low)
- Ensured safety of trail system access across Vandorf Sideroad
- Possible reimbursement of premiums paid for lots overlooking green space and estate lots
- Possible need for stormwater management pond instead of houses to manage and mitigate severe water damage
- Bayview/Vandorf streetscapes should be similar treatment as other local corners, e.g., fencing
- Sufficient hydro capacity for proposed subdivision
- OPA 34 boundary includes Monkman Court; why not Archerhill Court
- Enforcement of the Town's Green Development Standards

### **Planning Staff**

Staff addressed the concerns regarding density, traffic, environmental impact, groundwater impact, review of background studies and reports (including traffic, environmental impact, and hydrogeological), functional servicing plan and storm servicing, water pressure, trees, environmental protection area, emergency services, existing hydro capacity, stormwater runoff and engineering standards, OPA 34 boundaries, and compliance with the Town's Green Development Standards.

### **Applicant/Agent**

The Applicant/Agent addressed the concerns regarding trail connections and a possible second site access on Bayview Avenue.

**Moved by** Councillor Humfries

**Seconded by** Councillor Thompson

1. That Report No. PDS22-083 be received; and
2. That the comments presented at the Public Planning meeting be addressed by Planning and Development Services in a report to a future Public Planning meeting.

Yeas (6): Mayor Mrakas, Councillor Kim, Councillor Gaertner, Councillor Humfries, Councillor Thompson, and Councillor Gallo

Absent (1): Councillor Gilliland

**Carried (6 to 0)**

**5.2 PDS22-098 - Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, 2697331 Ontario Inc., 1289 Wellington Street East, File Numbers: OPA-2022-02 and ZBA-2022-02**

**Planning Staff**

Rosanna Punit, Planner, presented an overview of the staff report regarding the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications, noting the applicant proposes to develop 519 apartment units and twelve townhouse blocks consisting of 59 units, re-designate the subject lands from "Business Park" and "Linear and Other Open Space" to "Medium-High Density Residential" and "Linear and Other Open Space", and to re-zone the subject lands from "Rural Zone (RU)" to "Townhouse Dwelling Residential Exception Zone R8(XX)", "Second Density Apartment Residential Exception Zone RA1(XX)", and "Environmental Protection Zone (EP)".

**Applicant/Agent**

Heath Purtell-Sharp, Planner, Partner, Groundswell Urban Planners Inc., noted he was accompanied by Brad Rogers, Principal Planner, President, Groundswell Urban Planners Inc. Rick Hubbard, Project Director, GEI Consultants Ltd., and Henry Wang, Architect, AND Architecture Inc., were also present to answer questions. Mr. Purtell-Sharp presented an overview of the proposed development including site overview, key considerations, site plan, urban design guidelines, landscape plan, renderings, and elevations.

**Public Comments**

Aurora residents, including Alan Benlolo, David Brisley, Paola Di Iulio, Wendy Kenyon, Dan Orrett, Sandra Shephard, Ryan Shephard, George Skoulikas, and Klaus Wehrenberg, expressed the following comments:

Concerns regarding:

- Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process
- Proposed conversion of land use outside of MCR process
- Incompatibility of proposed apartment building development in area
- Density too high
- Setbacks
- Loss of significant woodland, protective buffer, cultural meadow, wetlands, wildlife habitat, green space

- Impact on creek and reduction of water quality
- Protection of flora and fauna, species at risk
- Lack of public transit to support proposed development
- Impact of dewatering to accommodate construction
- Increased traffic and noise pollution
- Traffic patterns, congestion, unsafe egress from subdivision
- Proposal too heavy and dense for gateway community
- Decreased water pressure

#### Suggestions regarding:

- Review of application in relation to the Trails Master Plan
- Respect established minimum buffers
- Relocate proposed access road outside of woodland
- Land designation should remain commercial to accommodate needs such as medical facilities
- More input from developer on possible revisions that could be made
- Need for transit hub in area

#### Questions regarding:

- Clarification on the MCR process and timing, employment land conversion changes to the employment area zones and densities map, projections for population and employment growth, and implications of the proposed development on growth projections
- Possible plans to widen Leslie Street
- Option for municipality to reject proposed land conversion
- Clarification on the proposed density vs. minimum zoning for Rural Zone (RU), proposed maximum net residential density vs. OPA 30 policy, and the MCR process target for greenfield vs. proposal
- Tracking of balance between residential and employment lands

#### Planning Staff

Staff addressed the concerns regarding density, land conversion, loss of trees, impact on natural environment, greater buffers and development limits, impact of access onto Leslie Street, and review of supporting documents. Staff further provided clarification on the ongoing MCR process, the Region's draft Official Plan, land use schedules and mapping changes, the Region's comments on the subject lands, and population and

employment forecasts. The Mayor confirmed that the MCR process is ongoing. Staff provided clarification on Rural zoning and the possibility of widening Leslie Street.

**Moved by** Councillor Thompson

**Seconded by** Councillor Humfries

1. That Report No. PDS22-098 be received; and
2. That the comments presented at the Public Planning meeting be addressed by Planning and Development Services in a report to a future Public Planning meeting.

Yeas (2): Mayor Mrakas, and Councillor Thompson

Nays (4): Councillor Kim, Councillor Gaertner, Councillor Humfries, and Councillor Gallo

Absent (1): Councillor Gilliland

**Defeated (2 to 4)**

**Moved by** Councillor Gaertner

**Seconded by** Councillor Gallo

1. That the applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment regarding 1289 Wellington Street East be refused as the proposed development does not conform to the Town's Official Plan, OPA 30, York Region's Official Plan, and the Provincial Policy Statement, for reasons including, but not limited to, the following:
  - a. The proposed development does not demonstrate there would be no negative impacts on environmental features; and
  - b. The proposed density is not appropriate for the site; and
  - c. There are significant issues with the MCR process and the land conversion from employment to non-employment.

Yeas (6): Mayor Mrakas, Councillor Kim, Councillor Gaertner, Councillor Humfries, Councillor Thompson, and Councillor Gallo

Absent (1): Councillor Gilliland

**Carried (6 to 0)**



**6. Confirming By-law**

**6.1 By-law No. 6424-22 Being a By-law to confirm actions by Council resulting from a Council Public Planning meeting on June 14, 2022**

**Moved by** Councillor Thompson

**Seconded by** Councillor Humfryes

That the confirming by-law be enacted.

**Carried**

**7. Adjournment**

**Moved by** Councillor Thompson

**Seconded by** Councillor Kim

That the meeting be adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

**Carried**

---

Tom Mrakas, Mayor

---

Michael de Rond, Town Clerk