



Our King

2051 Official Plan Review
Shaping Our Future

Official Plan Review: Community Open Houses What We Heard

October 2025

Developed by

KENNEDY
CONSULTING

Developed for

KING

ABOUT THE PROCESS

In September 2025, King Township hosted a series of open houses to gather community input on preliminary policy directions for the *Our King: 2051 Official Plan Review*. The following summary highlights what we heard from residents, business owners, and landowners across the Township and is accompanied by a separate table summarizing responses to specific, previous questions or those submitted through the open house comment form.

What?

The *Our King: 2051 Official Plan Review* is an update to King Township's long-term land use and growth management plan. The review ensures the *Our King Official Plan* continues to guide development in a way that reflects community priorities while meeting Provincial and regional planning requirements.

Why?

The review is required to bring the current Official Plan, approved in 2020, into alignment with new Provincial legislation, and incorporate the 2022 *York Region Official Plan*. The updated Plan will help determine how King can accommodate forecasted population and employment growth to 2051, while maintaining its small-town and rural character.

When & Where?

Three open houses were hosted in Schomberg (September 17), King City (September 18), and Nobleton (September 22). Materials and discussion topics were identical at all three sessions to provide a consistent experience.

Who?

The open houses brought together over 180 participants, including residents, business owners, and landowners. Township staff and members of Council were present to answer questions and discuss policy directions. Staff from Kennedy Consulting were also present to support dialogue and ensure that community input was clearly documented.

How?

Participants were invited to explore 13 themed stations corresponding to key planning topics. Each station included visuals and discussion prompts and was staffed by employees who could answer questions and record feedback. Input was captured through informal discussions, sticky notes, and a dot exercise highlighting emerging priorities. This stage of engagement focused on listening and learning from the community. No decisions were being made; instead, input from residents will help shape future amendments to King's Official Plan.

Next Steps

Feedback from the open houses will inform draft amendments to the policies of the *Our King Official Plan*. Updated policy material will be shared with the community in early 2026, along with another opportunity to review and comment before recommendations move forward to Council.

WHAT WE HEARD

During the open houses, participants shared ideas verbally with staff, wrote on sticky notes, and indicated preferences; their ideas are grouped, thematically, below.

1. The Vision for King

and

13. Implementing Our King

Participants reflected on what makes King special and how those qualities can be preserved as the community grows. Many described King as defined by its natural landscapes, friendly people, and distinct village character, and wanted growth to strengthen rather than erode these traits.

A few participants questioned the need for continued growth, noting that earlier feedback opposing development had not been reflected. Staff explained that the Official Plan Review must plan for Provincially mandated growth targets, and that this phase focuses on how and where growth should occur.

Participants also asked how new policies will be implemented in practice and how public feedback will continue to inform decisions over time.

We also heard:

- Support for maintaining a clear vision that protects King's small-town, rural identity.
- Interest in accountability measures to ensure the Plan is implemented consistently.
- Questions about how community feedback is documented and used to shape future decisions.

2. Complete Communities

There was broad agreement that King's villages should be complete, vibrant, and livable. Participants wanted each community to offer convenient access to shops, restaurants, green spaces, and essential services, while retaining its distinct charm and scale.

At the same time, many residents wrestled with the practical realities of achieving that vision. One participant noted the difficulty of reconciling an "idyllic, village feel" with the introduction of major transportation corridors or larger buildings. He, like many others, understood the need for economic development and local amenities like vibrant restaurants and accessible health care but worried that the accompanying traffic and busyness could erode the very qualities that make King appealing.

Participants also expressed:

- Interest in more gathering places, public spaces, and local businesses that serve everyday needs.
- Concern about parking and congestion near village centres.
- Desire for recreation facilities, including a pool in Nobleton, youth-friendly spaces, and programming for those with special needs.
- Support for accessibility improvements and age-friendly design.

3. Intensification

Participants shared mixed views on intensification. Some accepted the need for additional housing and development within existing settlement boundaries, provided it remains modest in scale and consistent with surrounding character. Others worried about the cumulative impacts of new growth on traffic, parking, and community identity.

In Schomberg, participants expressed relief that the urban boundary will remain fixed, while others in King City and Nobleton questioned whether planned intensification could outpace available infrastructure. Many emphasized the importance of context-sensitive development that enhances, rather than overwhelms, existing neighbourhoods.

We heard:

- Concern about “overdevelopment” and the loss of open space.
- Calls to preserve heritage streetscapes and maintain low-rise scale.
- Support for intensification near village cores but not within established residential areas.

4. Housing

Housing affordability was one of the most commonly discussed topics. Many participants spoke about the lack of attainable housing for younger families, first-time buyers, and long-time residents wishing to downsize. While there was understanding that growth targets require new homes, people questioned whether these would actually address affordability needs.

Participants supported the idea of greater housing diversity, including townhouses, smaller homes, and rental options, provided that development respects the existing character of each community. Some residents expressed concern about multi-residential buildings and a perception that new housing often caters to higher-income buyers.

Participants also noted:

- Desire for “missing middle” housing that blends well into existing neighbourhoods.
- Worries that new homes are becoming increasingly large and costly.
- Interest in policies that promote affordability without compromising quality or design.

5. Planning the Village Reserve

Comments about the Village Reserve were focused in Nobleton, where participants discussed options for future employment lands. Many expressed a preference for the east-side employment area (Option 1) and concern about potential conflicts between employment and nearby residential or commercial uses.

Noise, dust, and illegal business activity were mentioned as possible issues if development is not well managed.

Some questioned the need for additional employment lands in Nobleton, while others emphasized that any future growth should be phased, properly serviced, and carefully planned to reflect the community’s character.

6. Economic Development & Employment

Residents generally supported local economic development that complements King's character and strengthens village cores. Many appreciated the idea of local jobs that allow people to live and work within the Township, reducing commuting and fostering a stronger sense of community.

At the same time, participants expressed caution about large-scale or incompatible industrial uses. There was particular interest in encouraging businesses that contribute to daily life, such as cafés, local shops, and health and wellness services.

We also heard:

- Support for home-based businesses and small-scale entrepreneurship.
- Interest in local economic resilience, including creative and green industries.
- Calls to preserve employment lands for businesses that serve local residents.

7. Natural Heritage

and

8. Climate Change & Energy

Environmental protection emerged as a shared value across all three open houses. Participants expressed pride in King's natural landscapes and wanted stronger protections for forests, wetlands, and watercourses. Many residents linked environmental conservation directly to quality of life and identity.

There was broad support for stronger climate policies, renewable energy integration, and sustainable design. Participants wanted to see practical steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote energy efficiency, and protect against flooding and drought.

We also heard:

- Support for preserving tree canopy and expanding green spaces.
- Interest in energy-efficient buildings and incentives for renewable energy.
- Concern about increased flooding and stormwater management.
- Recognition that environmental leadership is part of King's identity.

9. King's Countryside

Protecting farmland and rural character was a unifying theme across all communities. Participants expressed deep attachment to King's countryside, describing it as both an economic asset and part of the Township's cultural heritage.

There was strong support for preserving the agricultural system and discouraging fragmentation of farmland. Participants also recognized opportunities for agri-tourism and local food initiatives that could diversify the rural economy while reinforcing King's identity.

Participants also expressed:

- Concern about rural estate development and loss of farmland.
- Support for on-farm diversified uses that remain secondary to agriculture.
- Desire for improved rural road maintenance and broadband access.

10. King's Hamlets

Discussions about King's smaller communities focused on maintaining their rural charm and identity. Participants wanted to see the hamlets recognized as distinct places within the Township, with modest, appropriately scaled growth that fits their character.

We also heard:

- Support for minor infill that aligns with the existing built form.
- Interest in preserving community landmarks and heritage structures.

11. Transportation

Transportation issues generated considerable discussion. Residents expressed frustration with congestion on major roads, limited transit service, and the challenges of moving safely through village centres.

Many linked transportation concerns directly to growth, worrying that new development could worsen existing traffic. Participants called for improvements to active transportation networks, including sidewalks, crosswalks, and cycling paths.

Participants also noted:

- Calls for better east-west connectivity and traffic calming.
- Interest in coordinated planning for transportation and land use.
- Desire for improved parking management in village cores.

12. Servicing Our Communities

Participants reflected on the importance of reliable infrastructure and servicing to support daily life in King. Many appreciated the Township's existing community facilities, such as recreation centres, libraries, and local programs, but noted that growth will require continued investment in both physical and digital systems.

In Nobleton, residents pointed to ongoing wastewater capacity constraints and stressed that new development should not proceed without adequate servicing in place. In rural areas such as Pottageville and Laskay, participants described persistent gaps in broadband and cellular coverage, asking when reliable service would reach their communities. Others highlighted the importance of maintaining and upgrading infrastructure such as roads, utilities, and communications networks to ensure that all areas of King can thrive as the Township grows.

Village Perspectives

While themes were broadly consistent across the Township, several priorities emerged more strongly in specific villages:

Schomberg

Participants emphasized protecting the urban boundary and preserving the village's small-town character. Parking availability and Main Street improvements were recurring priorities, with interest in revitalization that maintains heritage charm.

King City

Growth and intensification were most often linked to concerns about traffic congestion and infrastructure capacity. Residents called for more diverse housing, particularly for seniors and young families.

Nobleton

Participants highlighted ongoing concerns with water and wastewater capacity and its effect on growth. They also called for more recreation facilities and youth spaces and urged that any new development be coordinated with existing plans and servicing improvements.

Next Steps

Feedback from these open houses will inform refinements to the draft policy directions for the *Our King: 2051 Official Plan Review*. The Township will share updated policy materials with the public in early 2026 through a second round of engagement, offering another opportunity for residents, landowners, and businesses to review and comment.

Your ideas are valuable. Contact policyplanning@king.ca or visit <https://speaking.king.ca/our-king-official-plan-review>