

Appendix 'D'

Official Plan Review Comment Response Matrix

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
1.	Pina Cianni	October 6th, 2025	Email	The comment from emphasizes the importance of creating an age-friendly, walkable community in King City. She highlights that when she first moved to the area, essential services like grocery stores, bakeries, and community centers were within walking distance, but over time these have moved or disappeared, often replaced by housing. She expresses concern about where residents, especially those living in the King City core, will access necessary services. She suggests using the land where the Gord Orr Arena and Community Centre currently stand as an opportunity to develop a walkable downtown area featuring amenities such as an art gallery, outdoor art, local grocery stores, small shops, cafes, restaurants, and boutique stores. She envisions this area as a destination for both locals and visitors attending events at Memorial Park, advocating for a community design that prioritizes people, particularly those who do not drive or cannot use public transit, to restore the small-town charm King City once had.	<p>Thank you for sharing your comments on creating an age-friendly community in King City.</p> <p>The vision of a walkable core with accessible amenities such as grocery stores, small shops, cafes, and cultural spaces aligns closely with fostering complete, sustainable communities. <u>Complete Communities Discussion Paper</u> emphasizes the creation of a neighbourhood that meets the diverse needs of residents. It also encourages walkable streets, public gathering spaces, and the integration of commercial uses to foster a lively and connected environment.</p> <p>The opportunity to have a long-term vision for areas such as the site of the former Gord Orr Arena and Community Centre is being carefully considered within the Doctor's Lane Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plans seek to encourage mixed-use development, active transportation, and community gathering spaces within the Village Core of King City. The <u>Intensification Discussion Paper</u> includes updated concept plans and visual renderings for the Doctors Lane area, showcasing how redevelopment could occur through low-mid-rise buildings and mixed-use developments.</p> <p>An age-friendly lens will be applied as we begin drafting the Official Plan Amendment(s), ensuring that policies continue to support an inclusive, connected, and age-friendly Township of King.</p>
2.	MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture planning	October 6th, 2025	Emailed Letter	The document contains comments from MHBC, planning consultants for the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group (NSLG), regarding the Township of King's Official Plan Review focused on the Nobleton settlement area. The key points	Thank you for your detailed submission regarding the Township of King Official Plan Review and the planning considerations for the Nobleton Village Reserve. We appreciate the comprehensive analysis provided by MHBC on behalf of the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group, including the insights on land needs, infrastructure alignment,

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
	consultants for the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group (NSLG).			<p>are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for expanding the Nobleton Urban Area boundary to accommodate the 2051 population and employment forecasts. 2. Re-designation of lands within the Nobleton Urban Area from rural and agricultural to appropriate urban uses (residential, mixed use, commercial, employment, institutional) through a Village Site-Specific Policy Area (V-SSPA). 3. Emphasis on aligning infrastructure feasibility and growth readiness, including preliminary servicing solutions for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. 4. Identification of potential future road networks at a high level. <p>The Group requests further discussion on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Township-specific land needs for growth: Watson's GMS report indicates a need for 50 hectares of employment land and 8 hectares of residential land in Nobleton, with a deficit in community area land and employment area land by 2051. KPEC's findings differ, estimating a need for 184 hectares of community lands and suggesting the Township's Concept Plan underestimates residential land needs by 81-94 hectares. MHBC recommends expanding the Nobleton Urban Area boundary by an additional 81-94 hectares for residential purposes to address this shortfall. - Secondary Plan Policy for the Southwest 	<p>and the proposed approach to secondary planning.</p> <p>In terms of the Village Reserve, as outlined in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, the Project Team recognizes the importance of planning future land uses for the Reserve to provide certainty and clarity in their long-term land use, and to inform future infrastructure planning. However, the Township is not able to designate the lands for residential purposes through this Official Plan Review as it would exceed the Township's land needs for the maximum 30-year horizon contemplated under the PPS.</p> <p>Comprehensive secondary planning will be necessary for the Village Reserve to ensure that the land use designated for appropriate land uses and densities to ensure that it is best utilized. This approach is proposed to include site-specific policy areas that direct secondary planning for the southwest quadrant in accordance with current Council direction. Staff have also identified proposed directions to undertake secondary planning for the entire Village Reserve. Should Council endorse these policy directions the secondary planning exercises will be initiated following the completion of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>We appreciate your recommendations and comments and will continue to take them into consideration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Quadrant: MHBC supports delineating specific land use designations through a Nobleton Southwest Secondary Planning exercise, allowing for detailed review of infrastructure, natural environment constraints, land use compatibility, community needs, cost sharing, and phasing considerations. This approach aligns with standard municipal practices and supports growth management principles in the Official Plan.</p> <p>- The document includes maps illustrating the proposed Nobleton Southwest Secondary Plan area (215.85 hectares), Township Land Assessment Needs with Special Policy Areas XXX (133.91 ha) and YYY (81.94 ha), and KPEC Land Assessment Needs (215.85 ha).</p> <p>- MHBC suggests that the Official Plan policy should establish growth management principles, including land needs and limits of expansion, with detailed land use designations determined through the Secondary Plan process. Special Policy Areas would address lands for immediate development and deferred lands extending beyond the 2051 planning horizon.</p> <p>Overall, MHBC expresses appreciation for ongoing dialogue with the Township and hopes for continued discussions as policy development progresses.</p>	
3.	Land Needs Analysis prepared by Keleher	16-Jun-25	Emailed Attached Report	The document titled "Land Needs Analysis" for the Nobleton Community in King Township, prepared by Keleher Planning & Economic	Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the Growth Management Strategy (GMS).

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
	<p>Planning & Economic Consulting Inc. dated June 16, 2025.</p> <p>Submitted by MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture, planning consultants for the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group (NSLG).</p>			<p>Consulting Inc. (KPEC) for the Nobleton Landowners Group, dated June 16, 2025, provides a detailed assessment of land needs for residential development in the Township and specifically in Nobleton.</p> <p>Summary of Comments and Key Points:</p> <p>1. Overview and Context: - The 2024 Provincial Planning Statement requires municipalities to ensure sufficient land supply for a range of land uses to meet projected needs for 20 to 30 years. - King Township's projected growth rate from 2016 to 2051 is 102%, exceeding the regional average of 80%. - Nobleton, among the Township's villages, has the best opportunity to accelerate residential development due to available land and infill/intensification emphasis in other villages. - Nobleton is unique in having a designated greenfield area smaller than its settlement boundary, meaning new greenfield development must be within Nobleton, requiring additional land designation.</p> <p>2. Region-Wide Land Needs: - The Regional Land Needs Assessment (LNA) has questionable assumptions, including turnover rates of ground-related housing. - York Region faces a significant shortfall in ground-related housing units (over 101,000 units short). - The Region's urban expansion area planned</p>	<p>In terms of market conditions and Regional considerations, it is important to consider that the Official Plan Review is looking at a planning horizon of 2051. King also has limited long-term potential to accommodate low-density growth because of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine, is not considering accommodating additional population and housing units beyond the current forecasts for the Township.</p> <p>In terms of the Village Reserve, the Project Team recognizes the importance of planning future land uses for the Reserve to provide certainty and clarity in their long-term land use, and to inform future infrastructure planning. However, the Township is not able to designate the lands for residential purposes through this Official Plan Review as it would exceed the Township's land needs for the maximum 30-year horizon contemplated under the PPS.</p> <p>Comprehensive secondary planning will be necessary for the Village Reserve to ensure that the land use designated for appropriate land uses and densities to ensure that it is best utilized. This approach is proposed to include site-specific policy areas that direct secondary planning for the southwest quadrant in accordance with current Council direction. Staff have also identified proposed directions to undertake secondary planning for the entire Village Reserve. Should Council endorse these policy directions the secondary planning exercises will be initiated following the completion of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Further, in terms of the role of planning for York Region's growth needs, it is important to note that York Region is now an upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities. While this Official Plan Review considers the population forecast for King based on the population forecast of the YROP 2022 as a previously issued population forecast for the Township, future forecasts will be Township-specific and based on Ministry of Finance forecasts. This</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>for 36,000 units (2,300 hectares) is insufficient; actual needs may be 4,352 hectares, indicating a shortfall of about 2,035 hectares.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Region's 16-year supply of urban expansion lands is insufficient under both 2020 and 2024 Provincial Planning Statements. <p>3. Township-Specific Land Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - King Township has a community land shortage of approximately 184 hectares, about 10% of the regional shortfall. - The report does not include updated data from the Township's Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Addendum Report (June 11, 2025), with updates to be provided later. <p>4. Policy and Planning Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township is conducting a Growth Management Strategy and Official Plan Review to accommodate growth to 2051. - Population forecasts for Nobleton are limited by sanitary sewer servicing capacity, capping population at 6,750 by 2031. - Policies allow for growth beyond servicing capacity subject to infrastructure improvements and reviews. - Nobleton is the only village where greenfield area is less than the settlement boundary, requiring designation of additional lands for new development. - Intensification targets and growth monitoring policies are in place. 	<p>will likely result in the forecasts being considered at the lower-tier level, rather than any form of Region-wide land needs considerations. Nevertheless, the Township has the ability to revisit these forecasts and update its strategy accordingly through the next Official Plan Review if there are changes to these forecasts and expectations.</p> <p>We appreciate your recommendations and comments and will continue to take them into consideration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>5. Demographic and Housing Trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Migration to York Region has declined, with net outflows in recent years. - Natural increase (births minus deaths) is at a 20-year low. - Single-detached housing starts in King Township have declined significantly in the past five years. <p>6. Supply and Demand Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township's demand forecast estimates growth of 21,200 persons by 2051, with 305 housing units per year. - There is an estimated shortage of approximately 46 gross hectares of land in Nobleton's Designated Greenfield Area (DGA). - An alternate scenario with updated intensification rates shows a larger shortage of about 184 gross hectares. - The Region's LNA underestimates land needs by not differentiating housing unit types in supply and demand comparisons. - The Region's urban expansion lands and approved urban boundary expansions are largely allocated, with limited remaining Whitebelt lands. <p>7. Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - King Township's growth rate exceeds regional averages, requiring sufficient land supply to meet housing demand. - Nobleton offers the best opportunity for residential growth within the Township but requires designation of additional lands within its 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>settlement boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a significant shortfall of lands for residential uses at both the regional and Township levels. - The Township may need to accommodate more than the 184 hectares shortfall if regional shortfalls are not met elsewhere. - Updated data from the Township's Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Addendum Report will further inform land needs. <p>Overall, the comments emphasize the need for careful planning to address land shortages, infrastructure constraints, and demographic trends to ensure sufficient housing supply in Nobleton and King Township through 2051.</p>	
4.	Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd., planning consultant for TFP Nobleton Inc. (TACC Developments)	03-Oct-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The comments provided by Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. (MSH) on behalf of TFP Nobleton Inc. regarding the New Township of King Official Plan focus on the proposed land use and intensification targets for lands at 12650 Highway 27 in the Village of Nobleton.</p> <p>Key points summarized:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. **Subject Lands and Designations**: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are currently designated Rural and Agricultural under the 1970 Official Plan and are within the Nobleton Community Plan Area but outside the Urban Area Boundary. - In 2019, the lands were designated as Nobleton Village Reserve, a designation currently under appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal by the current owners. 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the proposed land use for 12650 Highway 27, and the approach to intensification and greenfield development in both King City and Nobleton.</p> <p>As identified through the potential intensification sites in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, there are currently more than sufficient lands in both Nobleton and King City to accommodate intensification at the rates endorsed by Council in February and June 2025, while still accounting for some sites that may not develop within the 2051 planning horizon, or sites that may develop for other purposes (i.e., commercial, office, etc.). Provincial policy is supportive of planning for intensification as it makes better utilization of infrastructure and community services, while also contributing to a more walkable and complete community.</p> <p>In terms of development to date in Nobleton, all residential development in Nobleton has been limited in recent years due to servicing constraints. The Township and York Region are working to</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>2. **Official Plan Review and Discussion Papers**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township is reviewing its Official Plan to guide development to 2051. - Discussion Papers address planning the Village Reserve and intensification. - The subject lands (39.7 hectares) are proposed to be re-designated to Residential (22 hectares) and Deferred Residential (17.7 hectares). <p>3. **Intensification Concerns**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed intensification rates for Nobleton (minimum 37%) and King City (minimum 56%) are considered unrealistic. - Limited intensification has occurred in Nobleton to date, mostly on larger remnant parcels. - Some designated intensification areas in Nobleton are unlikely to achieve significant intensification due to existing land uses, lot sizes, and redevelopment challenges. - The proposed densities, especially the 'Higher-Medium Density' level (80 units per hectare), are challenging to achieve on smaller lots. - The assumption that all intensification lands will be redeveloped by 2051 is considered unrealistic, especially as some parcels may be used for non-residential purposes. - The medium and high-density condominium market has stalled, adding uncertainty to achieving aggressive intensification targets. 	<p>resolve these limitations which would enable new development in the Village, both in the form of intensification and greenfield development.</p> <p>In terms of market conditions, it is important to consider that the Official Plan Review is looking at a planning horizon of 2051. It would be short-sighted to limit permitted land uses and density permissions within the Village Cores based on current economic conditions. Economic trends will likely continue to fluctuate and change over the next 25 years.</p> <p>As noted in your submission, a comprehensive Concept Plan has been prepared for southwest Nobleton, with proposed policy directions to support secondary planning for this area. Should Council endorse these directions they will inform the draft Amendments to Our King in early 2026.</p> <p>We appreciate your recommendations and comments and will continue to take them into consideration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>4. **Recommendations**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce Nobleton's minimum intensification rate to approximately 15-20%, translating to 420-450 units instead of 840. - For King City, adopt a minimum intensification rate of 35-40%, aligning with the original Growth Plan and reducing pressure on established neighborhoods. - Reallocate remaining intensification units to Nobleton greenfield areas to allow flexibility and better market adaptability. - Require additional greenfield land (30-50 hectares) to accommodate growth to 2051. - Extend Residential land use designation to the westerly portion of the TFP Nobleton property to support comprehensive planning and growth targets. <p>5. **Conclusion**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning for Nobleton should be comprehensive, including both residential and employment uses. - Carving out parts of the subject lands for non-residential uses is not seen as helpful for creating a complete community. - The subject lands should be designated Residential in their entirety at the earliest opportunity in the Official Plan Review. - MSH and the owners seek to continue engagement with the Township on the draft Official Plan. <p>Overall, the comments express significant</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				concern that the current growth management and intensification approach is overly ambitious and unrealistic for Nobleton and King City, advocating for a more balanced, achievable, and flexible planning strategy.	
5.	Malone Given Parsons Ltd.	13-Jun-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The comments provided by Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (MGP) on behalf of TFP Nobleton Inc. regarding the King Growth Management Strategy (King GMS) highlight several key concerns and recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overemphasis on High-Density Housing: The King GMS disproportionately focuses on high-density housing, particularly apartments, despite limited market demand, historical growth patterns, and local opposition. This approach conflicts with the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS 2024), which calls for a diverse range of housing types. 2. Unrealistic Intensification Target: The King GMS sets an intensification target of over 50%, mainly apartments, which is deemed unachievable due to King's limited transit infrastructure, Greenbelt constraints, and market demand. MGP suggests a more realistic intensification rate of around 30%, aligning better with King's planning context and supporting a balanced housing supply. 3. Lack of Unit-Type Demand Analysis: The King GMS does not properly analyze housing demand by unit type, blending densities and distorting land need projections. This risks 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the Growth Management Strategy (GMS).</p> <p>The forecast of high-density development identified in the GMS includes apartments, as well as stacked townhouses and additional residential units. It is also important to contextualize the historical trends. While the letter notes that only 214 apartments were built between 2006 and 2021, between 2020 and 2024 the Township averaged 59 high-density unit permits annually, which reflects a 215% increase. Further, the annual increase as determined through the GMS on this basis would be increasing to 280 annually between 2021 and 2051, which reflects a 163% increase, not the 900% increase identified in the letter.</p> <p>Further, based on building permit data, 103 units were built annually within the Township's built-up area (BUA), representing a 75% intensification rate for the Township. An intensification rate of 51% for the Township, including a rate of 37% for Nobleton and 56% for King City have been determined to be appropriate. As identified through the potential intensification sites in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, there are currently more than sufficient lands in both Nobleton and King City to accommodate intensification at the rates endorsed by Council in February and June 2025, while still accounting for some sites that may not develop within the 2051 planning horizon, or sites that may develop for other purposes (i.e., commercial, office, etc.). Provincial policy is supportive of planning for intensification as it makes better utilization of infrastructure and community services, while also contributing to a more walkable and complete community.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>underestimating low-density housing needs and overestimating high-density demand, leading to mismatched planning outcomes.</p> <p>4. Shortfall in Ground-Oriented Housing: Adjusting King GMS assumptions reveals a shortfall of approximately 53 hectares of Community Area land (about 1,300 ground-oriented units). Additionally, York Region's focus on high-density growth in urban municipalities has created a gap in ground-oriented housing supply, which King Township is well-positioned to help fill by accommodating displaced growth.</p> <p>5. Recommendation for Revised Growth Targets: MGP recommends revising King GMS to include an additional 1,850 housing units (110 hectares) to address regional market needs, resulting in a total of 3,150 units on 163 hectares of land.</p> <p>6. Subject Lands Potential: The Subject Lands at 12650 Highway 27 in Nobleton are vacant and suitable for accommodating ground-oriented housing growth, supporting a more balanced and sustainable approach to meeting housing needs in King.</p> <p>7. Conclusion and Request: MGP concludes that King Township needs to provide growth capacity, specifically in Nobleton, to meet the allocated population to 2051. They request that King revise its GMS analysis to include the Subject Lands for growth within the 2051</p>	<p>In terms of market conditions and Regional considerations, it is important to consider that the Official Plan Review is looking at a planning horizon of 2051. It would be short-sighted to limit permitted land uses and density permissions within the Village Cores based on current economic and regional conditions. These trends will likely continue to fluctuate and change over the next 25 years. Further, King also has limited long-term potential to accommodate low-density growth because of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine. Comprehensive secondary planning will be necessary for the Village Reserve to ensure that the land use designated for appropriate land uses and densities to ensure that it is best utilized.</p> <p>The subject lands at 12650 Highway 27 have been identified in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve as being considered for both residential and deferred residential development. Should Council endorse the proposed policy recommendations for a secondary plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton further discussion and engagement as to the appropriate land uses and densities for the site will be required.</p> <p>We appreciate your recommendations and comments and will continue to take them into consideration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>horizon.</p> <p>Overall, the comments emphasize the need for a more balanced housing strategy in King that realistically reflects market demand, local context, and infrastructure limitations, while incorporating the Subject Lands to support sustainable growth and diverse housing options.</p>	
6.	Dentons Canada LLP	03-Oct-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The document contains two letters from Dentons Canada LLP, dated February 10, 2025, and October 3, 2025, addressed to Stephen Naylor, Director of Growth Management Services, Township of King. The letters represent Lucyna and Przemyslaw Przybylski, owners of lands at 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane, King City, and discuss issues related to the King Township Official Plan Review ("King OP").</p> <p>Summary of comments and requests:</p> <p>1. Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands have two separate detached dwellings with individual municipal addresses, driveways, and private servicing. - The owners seek resolution of a technical severance issue through the Township's new Official Plan process. - Previous suggestions included future severance or site-specific policy options. <p>2. Encouragement from Discussion Paper 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.3 suggest revisiting lot creation policies in Rural Areas, especially in the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt. 	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the lands municipally known as 255 Lloyds Lane. These lands are located north of the Hamlet of Pottageville, and are within the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan areas.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.2.1 of Discussion Paper 9: King's Countryside, the Official Plan Review is exploring the appropriateness of revising lot creation policies for Rural lands in the Greenbelt Plan Area. In accordance with policy 3.1.4.5 of the Greenbelt Plan, municipal Official Plans are permitted to be more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan with respect to severances on Rural lands. The Greenbelt Plan currently permits the creation of a single lot for residential development on Rural lands within the Greenbelt Plan area, provided they comply with the minimum distance separation formulae, do not impact or fragment key natural heritage or key hydrologic features, and do not extend or promote strip development. Under the current policy framework an Official Plan Amendment application would be required to facilitate this form of lot creation, provided the proposal conforms with this policy of the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>Staff note that should King's Official Plan be amended to permit this form of rural lot creation, while the portion of the property on Lloyds Lane that is within the Greenbelt Plan area is designated Rural and Protected Countryside, it is also within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan. A comprehensive natural heritage review would</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The Township is considering offering more flexibility in lot creation for residential areas.</p> <p>- The owners' proposed solution aligns with this direction, seeking a technical severance to permit the existing condition.</p> <p>3. Policy Context:</p> <p>- The lands are designated Rural Area and Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area, zoned RU1 and ORMFP, and fall within Greenbelt Natural Heritage and Oak Ridges Moraine Feature Protection areas.</p> <p>- The lands have existing dwellings built in 1950 and 1973, with private septic and well servicing.</p> <p>- Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) 2024 permits severance of rural lands where site conditions support appropriate sewage and water services.</p> <p>- The Greenbelt Plan 2017 permits minor lot creation and adjustments under specific conditions, including no creation of separate lots for residential dwellings in prime agricultural areas.</p> <p>- The current King OP restricts new lot creation except in limited circumstances, including minor lot adjustments without creating separate residential lots and severance of surplus farm residences.</p> <p>4. Requests and Proposals:</p> <p>- Amend King OP policies to permit lot severance reflecting the existing condition of two dwellings on separate parcels without new development or site alteration.</p>	<p>be required to ensure that the proposed lot creation would not result in the fragmentation of natural heritage or hydrologic features.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and we encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- Suggested amendment to section 6.4.4.2 c) to allow minor lot adjustments or boundary additions that reflect existing residential dwellings without increased fragmentation of natural features.</p> <p>- Alternatively, adopt a site-specific policy recognizing the existing two detached dwellings as separately conveyable parcels subject to consent.</p> <p>- The proposed amendments align with PPS 2024 and Greenbelt Plan policies, recognizing existing uses and servicing.</p> <p>- No physical changes or impacts to the neighborhood or surrounding area would result from the severance.</p> <p>5. Conclusion:</p> <p>- The letters encourage the Township to incorporate these changes into the new King OP to resolve the technical severance issue.</p> <p>- The owners seek further discussions with Township staff on these proposed revisions.</p> <p>Overall, the comments advocate for policy flexibility in the King OP to allow a technical severance of the existing two-family homes on the lands, consistent with provincial policies and without new development or environmental impact.</p>	
7.	Nadia Venafro	Oct 3rd 2025	Emailed Letter	The comments in the document express concerns about the proposed increase in residential density in King Township, specifically at the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The key points	Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>raised include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed medium-density housing, including three-storey townhomes and a four-storey seniors' building, is not aligned with the character, history, or intent of the local community. 2. The land was originally sold to the Township with the expectation it would be preserved as public amenity-rich space, but the proposal reduces parkland and increases density in a single-family neighborhood. 3. Concerns about increased traffic and parking pressures, with existing infrastructure unable to handle the additional demand, leading to congestion and safety hazards. 4. The disruption of the established quiet, spacious, family-friendly character of the area, potentially lowering property values and livability. 5. Environmental degradation due to loss of green space and mature trees, which would increase local heat, reduce air quality, and harm wildlife habitats. 6. The proposed townhomes priced at \$1.5 million do not meet the criteria for "attainable housing," which should be in the \$750,000 to \$950,000 range for the community. 7. Frustration that public consultation feedback has not been meaningfully addressed, with community engagement seen as a procedural formality rather than a genuine opportunity for input. 	<p>importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To support the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p> <p>In terms of environmental considerations, environmental stewardship is a core value of the Township. The Official Plan includes comprehensive policies to protect natural heritage features, mature</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>The commenter urges the Council and Planning Department to reconsider the development strategy, engage more transparently with the community, and find solutions that respect both community needs and neighborhood character.</p>	<p>trees, and promote climate resilience. Development proposals must comply with these policies and incorporate green infrastructure and low-impact design.</p> <p>Finally, new definitions for attainable and affordable housing are explored through Discussion Paper 4: Housing. Should Council endorse the policy directions outlined in the Report, Staff will continue to develop new attainable and affordable housing targets for the Township that will be subject to further consultation in early 2026.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
8.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	21-Feb-25	Emailed letter	<p>The document is a submission from Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. on behalf of Trisan Construction regarding the Township of King's Growth Management Study and Official Plan Review, specifically focusing on the subject property at the southwest corner of 8th Concession Road and Highway 9.</p> <p>Key points summarized:</p> <p>1. **Review and Analysis**: Thorstone Consulting reviewed relevant provincial policies, the Township of King's Official Plan, zoning by-laws, strategic plans, and conducted site inspections. They also reviewed the Phase I Report by Watson and Associates and the "Working in King" Discussion Paper #3.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed submission dated February 21, 2025, regarding the Phase 2 Growth Management & Employment Strategy.</p> <p>We acknowledge the comprehensive review undertaken including the consideration of Provincial policies such as the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement, the Region of York Municipal Comprehensive Review, and the Township's current Official Plan and Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed designation of the lands west of 8th Concession Road and south of Highway 9 as a "Future Urban Employment Area" is consistent with the Growth Management and Employment Strategies, as well as preliminary policy directions outlined in Discussion Papers on <u>Economic Development and Employment</u> and <u>Natural Heritage</u>, subject to the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion process and consistency with Provincial policy.</p> <p>We note the subject property's location within the Protected</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>2. **Provincial Policy Context**: The 2024 Provincial Planning Statement allows planning beyond 25 years for employment areas, with a horizon of 20-30 years. The subject lands are within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan, but the Greenbelt boundaries may need reconsideration due to long-term growth projections to 2051.</p> <p>3. **Regional and Local Planning**: The Region of York's Municipal Comprehensive Review assigned population and employment projections to 2051. York Region Council supports allowing municipalities to access strategically located employment lands, including those along Highway 9, which is near the subject property.</p> <p>4. **Township Strategic Plans**: The Township's Corporate Strategic Plan (2023-2026) prioritizes creating complete communities and increasing local employment opportunities. The Official Plan emphasizes increasing local jobs, diversifying the economy, and leveraging proximity to Highway 400 and the Greater Golden Horseshoe for economic development.</p> <p>5. **Economic Development Strategy**: The Township's 2018 strategy highlights challenges with the residential tax base and lack of suitable employment lands. It sets goals to attract new business investment and expand existing businesses.</p>	<p>Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan and the identification of a portion of the lands as part of the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, which require further ecological study and review consistent with the policies of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plans. The Township is currently in the process of undertaking a Natural Heritage Study to determine if natural heritage features are present on the lands, and to assess their suitability in accommodating employment uses. The Natural Heritage Study will be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>We also acknowledge the importance of coordinating with the Region of York on servicing capacity and infrastructure improvements to support intensification and expansion within Schomberg. Therefore, the Region's water and wastewater Master Plan is being reviewed in the context of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Thank you again for your submitted comments.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>6. Employment Land Strategy: The Phase I report by Watson indicates a shortfall of employment lands in Nobleton and a need for an additional 21 hectares. Thorstone Consulting supports expanding the Schomberg Urban Area boundary to include the subject property as an employment area.</p> <p>7. Discussion Paper #3 Support: Thorstone generally supports the direction of Discussion Paper #3, which proposes expanding employment lands in Schomberg, but suggests that employment forecasts can exceed current targets to meet strategic objectives.</p> <p>8. Greenbelt Natural Heritage: The southern portion of the subject property is part of the Natural Heritage System within the Greenbelt. A qualified ecologist has been retained to study this feature, and the designation should be subject to specific review.</p> <p>9. Municipal Servicing: The Region of York's water and wastewater master plan should be reviewed to ensure servicing capacity for the proposed employment area expansion and intensification in Schomberg.</p> <p>10. Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Designate the lands west of 8th Concession Road and south of Highway 9 as a "Future Urban Employment Area." - Treat the Greenbelt Natural Heritage designation on the subject property as a special 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>study area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinate the Township's Growth Management and Official Plan review with the Region of York's Water and Wastewater Master Plan to address servicing needs for the proposed employment area. <p>The submission requests to be included in further communications and offers to discuss the submission in more detail.</p>	
9.	J. Bruce Craig, Chair, on behalf of CCKT Concerned Citizens of King Township	03-Oct-25	Emailed letter	<p>The comments from the Concerned Citizens of King Township (CCKT) on the King Township Official Plan Review focus on four main areas: Housing, Employment, Countryside, and Natural Heritage.</p> <p>1. Housing: CCKT supports the direction for housing that includes diverse options such as affordable, attainable, and purpose-built housing. They emphasize integrating gentle density in established neighborhoods, appropriate intensification in settlement areas, and expanding diverse housing forms. They highlight the need for attainable small-scale bungalows, especially for seniors, and promote "Pocket Neighbourhoods" as an efficient land use concept suitable for in-fill development.</p> <p>2. Employment: CCKT notes changes in employment patterns, including remote work and online retail, and stresses the importance of policies supporting these trends. They support locating employment areas within existing settlement boundaries for efficiency and cost-</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Regarding housing, we share your commitment to diversifying housing options, including affordable, attainable, and purpose-built rental housing. The Township is actively pursuing policies that promote gentle density in established neighbourhoods, intensification within the three Settlement Areas. We also recognize the importance of partnerships and government funding to achieve these goals.</p> <p>On employment, thank you for your comments regarding the proposed settlement area boundary expansion for King City, and the idea of redesigning King City Marketplace for increased commercial purposes. The Employment Land Strategy assessed current commercial sites, and applied an intensification rate to all existing commercial sites of 30%. As such, the commercial shortfall for King City already takes into consideration additional commercial space at the King City Marketplace.</p> <p>In terms of the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, a comprehensive review of sites in proximity to King City was undertaken before selecting the proposed site. This site is the only location in proximity to King City that is outside of the Oak Ridges Moraine, Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt and prime agricultural lands, as the lands are designated Rural and Protected</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>effectiveness. However, they oppose the proposed Employment/Commercial Area at Highway 400 and King Road due to poor connectivity, high municipal service costs, and negative impacts on the Greenbelt and agricultural land. Instead, they propose redesigning the under-utilized King City Marketplace and integrating commercial uses within existing employment areas in King City.</p> <p>3. Countryside: CCKT values the township's productive farmland and supports encouraging on-farm diversified uses and agri-tourism while protecting prime agricultural land. They view policies enhancing land use compatibility and environmental protection positively. They also advocate for innovation and emerging agricultural technologies to ensure long-term resilience, citing King Haven Greens as an example.</p> <p>4. Natural Heritage: CCKT emphasizes the importance of protecting King Township's abundant natural heritage, including forests, wetlands, lakes, streams, and meadows, particularly within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan areas. They strongly support continued protection and conservation efforts to maintain biodiversity and adapt to climate change. They endorse key directions such as undertaking a comprehensive Natural Heritage Study, strengthening ecological protection, integrating green infrastructure, supporting community stewardship and education, and</p>	<p>Countryside by the Greenbelt Plan. Based on the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan, settlement area boundary expansions are first to be directed to these areas. However, to inform the appropriateness of the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, the Township is undertaking a Natural Heritage Study. The findings associated with this study are targeted to be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>We appreciate your support for the protection and enhancement of the Countryside, including encouragement of on-farm diversified uses, agri-tourism, and agricultural innovation. King Township remains committed to safeguarding prime agricultural lands and promoting sustainable rural economic opportunities.</p> <p>Finally, the Natural Heritage Study that is currently underway is also reviewing the Township's current natural heritage policies, and natural heritage system mapping. As noted above, this study is targeted to be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>We encourage your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review, and look forward to engaging with you further as the project progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>implementing monitoring and restoration programs.</p> <p>In conclusion, CCKT appreciates the opportunity to provide input and hopes their comments contribute to a healthy and sustainable future for King Township. They look forward to participating in the next phase of the Official Plan Review.</p>	
10.	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	01-Oct-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The comments in the document are a submission from SGL Planning & Design Inc. on behalf of Fandor Homes regarding lands located at 6190 to 6230 King Road, Nobleton, as part of the Via Moto development. The submission requests that these lands be included in an expanded Nobleton Village Core and designated as part of a future Intensification Area in the Our King Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Key points from the comments include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Subject Lands are recognized as a Potential Intensification Area and are currently shown as "Medium Density" in the Intensification Discussion Paper. 2. The submitters request that stand-alone commercial uses be permitted on the site, alongside or instead of medium density residential uses, for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is narrow with limited depth, making medium density housing difficult due to setbacks and access constraints. - Individual driveways for townhouses are not feasible due to existing stormwater pond and 	<p>Thank you for your detailed submission regarding the request for commercial uses as part of the proposed Intensification Area for the lands at 6190 to 6230 King Road, Nobleton.</p> <p>The Township of King acknowledges the recognition of the Subject Lands as a Potential Intensification Area and appreciates the comprehensive rationale provided to support the inclusion of stand-alone commercial uses within this area. We note your review of the site's unique characteristics, including its narrow depth, limited residential interfaces, and proximity to the existing Nobleton Village Core.</p> <p>As detailed in the Phase 2 Employment Land and Growth Management Strategy prepared by Watson & Associates Ltd., that was presented to Council in February 2025, Nobleton has sufficient lands for population-related employment uses. However, there is still a need to ensure that sufficient lands are provided for a variety of land uses.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 3: Intensification identifies the site as a potential intensification area, able to accommodate medium density residential development. A land use designation has not yet been proposed for the site. Should Council endorse the intensification framework presented in the Discussion Paper and the proposed policy directions, further review will be required by the Township to ensure that they</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>access restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed-use developments would require additional parking and complex access arrangements. - Commercial uses would have limited interfaces with sensitive residential uses and can be designed to provide high-quality urban design. - Stand-alone commercial uses would complement proposed live-work units nearby and serve the core of Nobleton. - Commercial uses would support surrounding residential densities and help meet employment growth targets. - Recent provincial planning changes remove "supportive employment uses" from employment land areas, so alternative commercial locations are needed. - No additional servicing allocation is required for commercial uses, allowing development to proceed in advance of mixed-use proposals. <p>3. The Subject Lands are strategically located about 115 meters west of the existing Village Core, with limited intervening lots, making them suitable for extending the Village Core westward.</p> <p>4. The lands are well-buffered from sensitive residential areas and would support small-scale commercial uses and future medium density developments.</p> <p>5. Extending the Village Core/Intensification Area to include the Subject Lands would improve accessibility to daily services within an 800-meter walkable radius, fostering a more</p>	<p>lands are placed in an appropriate land use designation that would be capable of facilitating a variety of uses, including medium density residential uses.</p> <p>Staff are happy to continue to work with you and the landowner as the Official Plan Review progresses, and will consider your comments regarding the appropriateness of extending the Village Core to this site as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>complete and sustainable community.</p> <p>6. The site's location on an arterial road and its context make it well-positioned to accommodate non-residential uses with minimal impact.</p> <p>7. A preliminary commercial concept plan demonstrates how commercial uses can be integrated with appropriate setbacks and massing.</p> <p>8. The submission emphasizes the importance of commercial uses in meeting the Township's growth and employment objectives and supporting the day-to-day needs of the west Nobleton community.</p> <p>In summary, the submission advocates for the inclusion of the Subject Lands in the expanded Village Core and Intensification Area with permission for stand-alone commercial uses to better serve the community, support employment growth, and complement future residential development.</p>	
11.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	02-Oct-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The comments from Paul Brown & Associates Inc. (PBA), representing Fandor Homes, regarding the Official Plan (OP) Review for lands at 6375 King Road, 6675 King Road, and 12805 10th Concession in the Township of King, express support for the Township staff's consideration of expanding the Nobleton Village Area Reserve, specifically in the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. PBA is pleased that the merits of their recent submission have been generally reflected in the preliminary concept plan for this area. They do not have additional comments at this time but look forward to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As you are aware, planning for the Nobleton Village Reserve is being carefully evaluated to ensure alignment with the growth management strategy that was adopted by Council earlier this year.</p> <p>We appreciate your support for the proposed expansion and the reflection of your submission's merits in the preliminary concept plan. We welcome ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				monitoring the Township's progress and engaging in future discussions. PBA is open to meeting with staff for any specific input or clarification as the concept plan and land use schedule are further refined. They also thank the Township for the opportunity to participate in the OP Review process and offer direct contact for any questions.	
12.	John Hollick	Wed 10/1/2025	Emailed letter	<p>The comments provided in the document express concerns about the omission of estate lots in King Township's new Official Plan. The key points summarized are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background: King Township has a long history as a rural community with notable estate subdivisions, such as Kingscross Estates, which began in the 1950s and includes large lots between Jane and Keele Streets. These estates have a unique cultural and historical significance, with connections to prominent families and institutions. 2. Current Situation: Estate subdivisions like Kingscross Estates have grown to include diverse residents and entrepreneurs who contribute to the township's development and community character. The draft official plan addresses many issues but tends to ignore the history and benefits of estate lots, such as a strong sense of rural community, heritage conservation, and a distinct cultural fabric. 3. Concerns: The draft plan should better reflect the unique heritage and lifestyle benefits of 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding King Township's Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Our King Official Plan (2019) already includes policies that protect the character and integrity of estate residential areas, particularly those designated as Established Neighbourhoods which includes the Kingscross Estates neighbourhood. These policies discourage the creation of new lots through severance unless an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment can demonstrate compatibility with the existing neighbourhood's lotting pattern, size, and character. Specifically, Section 5.5.4 of the Plan outlines that new residential lots are generally not permitted in these areas unless they meet strict criteria related to lot area, frontage, depth, vegetation, and built form compatibility.</p> <p>Village Site-Specific Policy Area 4 (V-SSPA-4) in the Our King Official Plan applies to the Kingscross Estates neighbourhood in King City. The site-specific policies under to require a minimum lot area is designed to preserve the established estate residential form, ensuring that future development maintains the area's low-density nature.</p> <p>We acknowledge the importance of protecting existing estate residential areas, including those not served by municipal services. The Our King 2051 Official Plan Review offers an opportunity to strengthen these protections. The review can carefully consider additional policies that prevent the creation of smaller lots in estate</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>estate lots, including enhanced security, community, amenities, and peaceful environment. The commenter urges protection of the character of existing estate residential areas, especially those not on municipal services, and opposes subdividing these large lots into smaller ones.</p> <p>4. Policy Recommendations: The plan should protect valued resources and local identity by ensuring growth respects cultural heritage. The commenter highlights that estate subdivisions were created with a plan and should not be subjected to further subdivision into smaller lots.</p> <p>5. Definition of Estate Lots: Estate lots are described as large parcels in prestigious or rural settings, offering privacy, luxury, scenic views, proximity to amenities, and exclusivity, often within gated or private communities.</p> <p>Overall, the commenter requests that the Official Plan recognize and protect the unique character, heritage, and benefits of estate lots in King Township, preventing their subdivision into smaller lots and preserving their role in the community.</p>	<p>residential areas, particularly where municipal servicing is not available or could undermine their existing character.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p> <p>Thank you again for your comments.</p>
13.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	13-Aug-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided in the document from Paul Brown & Associates Inc. represent the interests of Fandor Homes regarding lands at 6375 King Road, 6675 King Road, and 12805 10th Concession in the Township of King, specifically within the Nobleton Urban Area. The letter introduces a preliminary concept plan for</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>the wider Nobleton West area, aiming to guide long-term growth and update the Official Plan (OP) and Growth Management Strategy (GMS) for a more complete community.</p> <p>Key points of the concept plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporation of natural heritage features and buffers to promote land use compatibility. - Anchoring the west gateway to Nobleton with a significant recreation facility serving the Township and wider region. - Establishing more employment lands with varied lot sizes and tenancies aligned with GMS objectives. - Providing more housing supply with low-density residential homes that maintain the village's local character, complemented by higher density housing forms to address council priorities and growth projections. <p>The concept plan is presented at a scale and detail level that allows refinement through further collaboration with Township staff. The letter expresses openness to meaningful discussions about including these lands within the Nobleton Urban Boundary and establishing long-term planning policies for Nobleton. The attached map visually outlines land uses including single detached residential, employment, institutional, natural heritage protection, parks, and stormwater management ponds.</p>	<p>the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>
14.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	31-Jul-25	Letter	The comments provided by Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. regarding the Township of King 2051 Official Plan Review	Thank you for your submission regarding Wingberry Farms at 12800 8 th Concession.

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>focus on the Wingberry Farms property at 12800 8th Concession. The key points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thorstone Consulting Services represents the registered owner of the Wingberry Farms property and has been actively engaged in the Township's Official Plan Review process, providing written comments since August 2023 and a deputation at the June 17, 2025, Council meeting. 2. They requested a modification to staff's recommendation to include Wingberry lands in the analysis of location options for the Designated Growth Area (DGA) Community Area in Nobleton, specifically endorsing a 30-hectare deficit for Nobleton and asking for a comprehensive plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. 3. Although the Township Council did not implement this modification, Thorstone Consulting Services continues to ask for Wingberry Farms to be analyzed as a potential DGA Community Area. 4. They highlight that parts of Wingberry Farms are identified within the Village Reserve in the Township's Official Plan and suggest that the area between existing Village Reserve portions should also be identified as Village Reserve due to its coniferous tree cover and ecological functions. 	<p>We acknowledge your engagement in the Official Plan Review process and appreciate the detailed analysis and recommendations provided. The Township recognizes the importance of carefully balancing growth management with the preservation of our rural, cultural, and natural heritage, consistent with our vision for King.</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Wingberry Farms property.</p> <p>Alternatively, the landowner can also look to advance site-specific applications, such as an Official Plan Amendment supported by the necessary studies and background information, including but not limited to natural heritage evaluations, and ecological studies to consider redesignating lands from Village Natural Heritage System to Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>5. They are conducting ecological studies to support the removal of the natural heritage designation on part of the property and will update the Township accordingly.</p> <p>6. Their formal recommendations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove the area identified in yellow on Figure 5 from the Village Natural Heritage System. - Identify the yellow area on the subject property as Village Reserve per Figure 5. - Consider the existing and proposed Village Reserve lands on the property for settlement area boundary expansion for residential purposes in the 2051 planning horizon. <p>7. They express willingness to meet with Township staff to discuss their submission in more detail and provide further input into the Official Plan Review process.</p> <p>The attached Figure 5 map visually supports these comments by showing the subject lands, Village Reserve designation, potential additional village residential area, and Village Natural Heritage System boundaries.</p>	
15.	Issa Young	July 8 2025	Email	<p>The comments in the document revolve around traffic calming measures and related concerns on Dufferin Street, particularly between Miller Sideroad and Davis Drive. Key points include:</p> <p>1. Resident Concerns and Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposition to a 2050 plan to widen Dufferin Street due to unclear purpose, lack of budget, 	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding traffic calming measures on Dufferin Street between Miller Sideroad and Davis Drive.</p> <p>The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update 2025 is on-going and happening concurrently to the Official Plan Review, which is intended to align with the vision and objectives of the TMP. We understand your concern about increasing traffic on Dufferin Street between Miller Sideroad and Davis Drive. Your correspondence has also been</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>and safety concerns; request for formal removal from future plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requests for specific traffic calming measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Install clear 40 km/h speed limit signage north of Davis to match existing signs. - Restrict cut-through traffic by working with Google Maps to remove recommended shortcuts and install "Local Traffic Only" and "Hidden Driveway" signs. - Enforce a ban on trucks over 5 tons per axle year-round on Dufferin Street from Davis to Miller's Sideroad. - Request for updates on traffic studies and camera installations, including status of traffic calming measures promised for 2025. - Interest in accessing traffic monitor data via Freedom of Information requests, with questions about equipment maintenance and data logging. - Concerns about speeding (up to 100 km/h on a 60 km/h road), truck traffic violating by-laws, and resulting accidents and debris. - Request for case numbers and designated points of contact for each issue to coordinate next steps and updates. - Desire for in-person meetings to discuss concerns further. <p>2. Responses from Township Officials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dufferin Street north of Davis Drive is signed at 60 km/h; speed reductions require studies and bylaw revisions. - Residents can submit complaints or traffic calming requests for study. 	<p>forwarded to the Township's Public Works Staff for their information.</p> <p>Dufferin Street north of Davis Drive is currently signed at 60 km/h. Any reduction to 40 km/h requires a traffic study and bylaw revision to justify the change. Residents are encouraged to submit traffic calming requests or road watch complaints through the York Regional Police online reporting system for further review.</p> <p>The Township does not have authority over Google Maps routing; however, we will explore options to work with the platform to address shortcut routing concerns. "Local Traffic Only" signs are temporary and not regulatory unless directed by Council. Hidden driveway signage is not regulated under current Township by-laws, but driveway locations are identified for emergency services.</p> <p>Enforcement of truck restrictions falls under York Regional Police or the Ministry of Transportation. Township By-law Officers do not have authority to stop moving vehicles for truck violations.</p> <p>Flexible bollards and ASE cameras are scheduled for installation on Dufferin Street between King Street and Graham Sideroad as part of a rotational program. Traffic counters have been installed near Miller Sideroad, with data collection underway to inform future measures.</p> <p>The 2051 plan to widen Dufferin Street remains under review. At this time, there is no allocated budget to proceed, and resident safety concerns are being carefully considered. The Township will communicate any updates or changes to these plans as they develop.</p> <p>The Township is committed to balancing growth management, transportation safety, and community quality of life in alignment with our Official Plan vision. We appreciate your patience as we coordinate across departments and with regional partners to address these complex issues.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local traffic signs are temporary and not regulatory; enforcement authority is limited. - Enforcement of truck traffic bans falls under Ministry of Transportation or York Regional Police, not bylaw officers. - Flexible bollards and Automated Speed Enforcement cameras are planned for installation soon on Dufferin Street. - Traffic counters have been installed and data collection is underway. - Some items fall under different departments (Operations, By-law). - Township acknowledges receipt of concerns and is reviewing them, promising comprehensive responses. <p>3. Communication and Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents express frustration over lack of action despite prior commitments. - Requests for clarity on timelines, enforcement, and data availability. - Multiple emails exchanged among residents, public works, bylaw services, and planning departments. - Residents seek assurance that the mayor and council are informed and involved. <p>Overall, the document captures a detailed dialogue between concerned residents and municipal officials regarding traffic safety issues on Dufferin Street, with residents pushing for concrete measures and accountability, and officials providing procedural context and planned actions.</p>	<p>Please direct any further inquiries or requests for updates to the Public Works Department, where a designated point of contact can be assigned to coordinate next steps and provide case-specific information.</p> <p>Thank you for your ongoing engagement and commitment to the safety and well-being of our community.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
16.	Malone Given Parsons Ltd.	July 21st, 2025	Emailed Letter	<p>The document is a letter from Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (MGP), planning consultants representing 1001004791 Ontario Inc., owners of lands at 92 and 105 Diana Drive in Nobleton, Township of King. The letter is addressed to the Township of King regarding future development considerations as part of the Township's Official Plan Review and Growth Management Strategy.</p> <p>Summary of comments and requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusion in Community Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The client requests that the Township Council include the lands at 92 and 105 Diana Drive in the Community Area. - This is to avoid creating isolated parcels if the lands west of the subject lands are designated for development. 2. Access Connectivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The client requests that access to the subject lands be provided via lands to the north. - This is to facilitate appropriate connectivity and avoid reliance on Diana Drive, which is a public right-of-way characterized by estate residential dwellings. - The client believes future access through Vaughan is unlikely and requests primary access from the north to support higher density development. 3. Context and Background: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject lands total approximately 14.36 hectares (10.5 ha + 3.8 ha) and are currently 	<p>Thank you for your detailed submission regarding properties municipally known as 92 and 105 Diana Drive in the Village of Nobleton. The Township has acknowledged your request.</p> <p>As noted in your submission, The Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Addendum Report dated June 2025 identified a 30-hectare shortfall of Community Area land for Nobleton over the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township cannot designate lands for Community Area residential purposes beyond a 30-year planning horizon.</p> <p>However, in order to provide clarity and increased certainty in future land use both within and beyond the 2051 planning horizon the Township has prepared a Concept Plan for Southwest Nobleton that is included in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve. This Concept Plan builds off the Location Options that were presented to Council through the Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy, and set out proposed future land uses for all lands within southwest Nobleton.</p> <p>92 and 105 Diana Drive are identified on the Concept Plan as part of the "Deferred Residential" area, which covers an area of approximately 49 ha. Deferred residential identifies that these lands would be contemplated for Community Area residential uses at a future date, beyond the 2051 horizon, but directs that these lands are proposed to be designated for residential uses long-term.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025, Report to Council seeks Council's endorsement of the Concept Plan, and direction to develop policies for a Site-Specific Policy Area for south-west Nobleton that aligns with the Concept Plan, and provides a framework for a future secondary plan for southwest Nobleton in order to undertake the necessary land use and infrastructure planning to enable growth in this quadrant.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>designated as Nobleton Village Reserve, outside the Nobleton Urban Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are located immediately north of the King Vaughan municipal boundary and are currently used for agricultural purposes. - The Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy (GMS) Addendum Report (June 11, 2025) identifies a deficit of approximately 30 hectares of Community Area land in Nobleton. - The Addendum presents three options to accommodate this shortfall, with the subject lands included in Option 3 (approximately 38 hectares on the west side of Highway 27, north of the subject lands). <p>4. Basis for Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If Option 3 is selected, the subject lands would remain an island of undesignated land unless included in the Community Area. - The client supports the Township's identification of additional lands but believes the proposed residential land quantity is too conservative. - The KPEC report indicates approximately 184 hectares of residential land is required, suggesting a significant shortfall even with the 71 hectares of candidate lands identified. <p>5. Supporting Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix A shows the net developable area of the subject lands, approximately 11 hectares. - Appendix B shows the location of the subject lands relative to the three Community Area growth options. 	<p>Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Conclusion: The client requests the Township Council to consider including 92 and 105 Diana Drive in the Community Area and to ensure access is provided from the north to facilitate appropriate connectivity and future development. They emphasize the need to address the shortfall in residential land to support infrastructure and community services.</p> <p>The letter is signed by Joan MacIntyre, Principal, and Ben McKillop, Planner, from Malone Given Parsons Ltd.</p>	
17.	Innovative Planning Solutions	16-Jun-25	Emailed letter	<p>The document is a detailed submission from Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) on behalf of the landowners of the "Subject Lands" located at 25 Laskay Mills Drive, Township of King, Ontario. The submission responds to the Township of King's Official Plan Review, specifically addressing the Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategies.</p> <p>Key points from the comments include:</p> <p>1. **Correction to Phase 2 Report**: IPS requests a revision of Figure 7-2 in the February 2025 Phase 2 Report to include the eastern portion of the Subject Lands near Highway 400 in the proposed Employment designation. They provide a Conceptual Plan showing a realignment of a stream and buffers to support this designation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 25 Laskay Mills Drive.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 10: King's Hamlets, provides an overview of the policies for King's Hamlets, including the Hamlet of Laskay. In terms of 25 Laskay Mills Drive, it recognizes that the delineation of the Hamlet boundary was deferred by York Region for this property through the approval of the Our King Official Plan by the Region in 2020. As such, the Township will be looking to make a decision on the Hamlet boundary for these lands through the current Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes policy directions to incorporate 25 Laskay Mills Drive into the Hamlet boundary of Laskay, and provides direction to guide the development of site-specific policy areas for the lands to facilitate their redesignation for Hamlet Employment and Hamlet Residential purposes.</p> <p>The Project Team appreciates the preparation of the Conceptual Plan by the commenter. Should Council endorse the directions outlined in the Discussion Paper and October 27, 2025 Report to Council, the Project Team will continue to work with the commenter and landowner</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>2. **Support for Rural Hamlet Employment and Residential Uses**: The landowner supports expanding rural hamlet employment opportunities and requests that the Township consider diversifying land uses on the Subject Lands to include residential uses alongside employment uses. They ask that both designations be reflected in the Town's Draft Official Plan.</p> <p>3. **Support for Inclusion in Employment Area**: The landowner supports including the Subject Lands in the Town's Employment Area but requests recognition of existing residential uses in the Hamlet of Laskay and the opportunity for mixed residential and employment uses on the Subject Lands.</p> <p>4. **Description and Context**: The Subject Lands are 30.47 hectares, rectangular, with frontage on Highway 400, adjacent to the Hamlet of Laskay, and surrounded by residential, rural, and agricultural uses.</p> <p>5. **Planning History**: The landowners have engaged with York Region and Township staff through Official Plan Review (OPR) processes and Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) meetings to discuss development options and boundary expansions for the Hamlet of Laskay.</p> <p>6. **Proposed Development and Land Use Designations**: IPS proposes a Conceptual Block Plan including:</p>	<p>to further discuss the delineation of the lands, appropriate land use designations, and protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extension of Laskay Mills Drive to connect to King Road. - A 9.38-hectare Residential Designation Block. - An Employment Block divided into four ~2.5-hectare lots. - Mixed-use designation including commercial, employment, residential, and live-work uses. <p>7. **Land Use Policy and Regulatory Framework**: The submission reviews relevant policies from the Provincial Planning Statement 2024, Greenbelt Plan 2017, York Region Official Plan 2022, and Township of King Official Plan. It highlights the need for a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) to include the Subject Lands in the Hamlet of Laskay and supports a mix of land uses to create complete communities.</p> <p>8. **Zoning and Hamlet Plan**: The Subject Lands are currently split-zoned under the Greenbelt Natural Heritage, Agricultural, and Open Space zones with site-specific exceptions. An Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment would be required to facilitate the proposed development.</p> <p>9. **Comments on Township Discussion Papers**: IPS supports lifting the prohibition on major development in Hamlets to allow for sustainable growth and economic development. They request the inclusion of the Subject Lands in the Hamlet of Laskay and support a mix of</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>residential and non-residential uses to support the community and regional housing needs.</p> <p>10. **Environmental Considerations**: The site includes environmental features within the Greenbelt requiring detailed study and stream realignment, which IPS is addressing with ecological expertise.</p> <p>11. **Conclusion and Requests**: The landowner requests that the Township staff and Council consider the IPS Conceptual Block Plan for expansion of the Hamlet of Laskay Settlement Boundary and mixed land use designations. They seek ongoing dialogue through the OPR process and express willingness to continue engagement with Township staff.</p> <p>Overall, the submission advocates for a balanced, mixed-use development approach on the Subject Lands that supports rural employment, residential growth, and environmental stewardship within the Township of King's planning framework.</p>	
18.	Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP	17-Jun-25	Emailed Letter	<p>The document contains comments and analysis from the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group, represented by Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP, regarding the Official Plan Review and Growth Management Strategy for King Township, specifically focusing on the southwest quadrant of the Nobleton settlement area ("Subject Lands").</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the Growth Management Strategy (GMS).</p> <p>In terms of market conditions and Regional considerations, it is important to consider that the Official Plan Review is looking at a planning horizon of 2051. King also has limited long-term potential to accommodate low-density growth because of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine, and is not considering accommodating additional</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Key points summarized:</p> <p>1. Background and Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Group represents registered owners of parcels in the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. - They have retained Keleher Planning and Economic Consulting (KPEC) to conduct a Land Needs Analysis for the Region of York and King Township, with a report dated May 23, 2025. - The Group supports further examination of growth potential in southwest Nobleton, considering new provincial policies and market needs. <p>2. Policy and Planning Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The analysis considers the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), repeal of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and York Region's Land Needs Assessment (2022). - The new PPS requires municipalities to plan for at least 20 years but no more than 30 years of growth. - King Township's Official Plan (OP) currently forecasts growth to 2031, with a review underway to extend to 2051. <p>3. Land Needs Analysis Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The KPEC report uses a methodology aligned with current provincial policy, focusing on market demand by housing unit type. - The Region of York has a residential land deficit of 4,352 hectares, 2,035 hectares more than the Region's own estimate. - King Township specifically has a need for 	<p>population and housing units beyond the current forecasts for the Township.</p> <p>In terms of the Village Reserve, the Project Team recognizes the importance of planning future land uses for the Reserve to provide certainty and clarity in their long-term land use, and to inform future infrastructure planning. However, the Township is not able to designate the lands for residential purposes through this Official Plan Review as it would exceed the Township's land needs for the maximum 30-year horizon contemplated under the PPS.</p> <p>Comprehensive secondary planning will be necessary for the Village Reserve to ensure that the land use designated for appropriate land uses and densities to ensure that it is best utilized. This approach is proposed to include site-specific policy areas that direct secondary planning for the southwest quadrant in accordance with current Council direction. Staff have also identified proposed directions to undertake secondary planning for the entire Village Reserve. Should Council endorse these policy directions the secondary planning exercises will be initiated following the completion of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Further, in terms of the role of planning for York Region's growth needs, it is important to note that York Region is now an upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities. While this Official Plan Review considers the population forecast for King based on the population forecast of the YROP 2022 as a previously issued population forecast for the Township, future forecasts will be Township-specific and based on Ministry of Finance forecasts. This will likely result in the forecasts being considered at the lower-tier level, rather than any form of Region-wide land needs considerations. Nevertheless, the Township has the ability to revisit these forecasts and update its strategy accordingly through the next Official Plan Review if there are changes to these forecasts and expectations.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>approximately 184 hectares of additional land to meet demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nobleton is identified as the best location within the Township to accommodate growth, as it is the only village where the designated greenfield area is smaller than the settlement area boundary. - Existing servicing constraints in Nobleton have limited growth historically, but full build-out potential has not been studied due to current land designations. <p>4. Recommendations and Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Group supports redesignating the Subject Lands from Nobleton Reserve Area to permit urban uses in the Township's Official Plan Review. - This redesignation aligns with provincial growth management policies and York Region's Official Plan. - Long-range planning should not be driven solely by servicing constraints but should plan for appropriate growth consistent with provincial policy. - The analysis shows a significant shortfall of lands for residential uses that Nobleton can address without requiring an urban boundary expansion. - The Group emphasizes the importance of meeting market demand and provincial policy direction in growth management. <p>5. Supporting Data and Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maps showing the location of the Subject 	<p>We appreciate your recommendations and comments and will continue to take them into consideration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Lands within the Nobleton Community Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KPEC's detailed Land Needs Analysis report, including demographic trends, housing demand and supply comparisons, and policy analysis. - Tables and figures illustrating population growth forecasts, housing unit supply and demand by type, and land supply shortfalls. <p>Overall, the comments advocate for recognizing the growth potential of the southwest quadrant of Nobleton by redesignating lands to urban uses to meet projected housing demand in line with updated provincial policies and regional growth management strategies.</p>	
19.	Weston Consulting	07-May-25	Emailed letter	<p>The comments provided by Weston Consulting on behalf of Anatolia Capital Corp. regarding the Our King: 2051 Official Plan Review focus on the subject lands located at 13555 10th Concession Road in the Township of King. These lands are situated southeast of the 15th Sideroad and Concession Road 10 intersection, outside the existing Nobleton Urban Area but within the Village of Nobleton Settlement Area boundary. The lands cover approximately 41.2 hectares (101.8 acres) with frontage along Concession Road 10.</p> <p>Key points include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning Context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject lands are designated as Community Area in the York Region Official Plan (YROP) and as Nobleton Village Reserve in the Township of King Official Plan (King OP). 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding 13555 10th Concession.</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon. Further, in accordance with Council direction from early 2025, Staff have been directed to focus the Community Area and Employment Land needs to 2051 within the southwest quadrant of the Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>However, Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Anatolia Capital Corp. property.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are zoned Rural General (RU1) by the Township, primarily permitting agricultural uses. - The Nobleton Village Reserve lands are outside the current Nobleton Urban Area Boundary but are identified for long-term growth beyond 2031. <p>2. Official Plan Review and Growth Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - King's Official Plan Review aims to accommodate a population increase to 51,000 residents by 2051. - Nobleton is expected to grow by 6,530 people and 770 jobs by 2051, with a shortfall of 8 hectares of community land identified. - To address this shortfall, King proposes redesignating land from the Nobleton Village Reserve for new community residential areas, with three potential options identified. <p>3. Suitability of Subject Lands for Residential Growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 1 (the subject lands) has minimal environmental or compatibility constraints and about 11 hectares of developable area. - Options 2 and 3 have greater constraints and adjacency to proposed employment uses, which may cause land use compatibility challenges. - The subject lands are adjacent to existing vacant land designated for residential growth and a recently approved residential subdivision. - The lands are currently underutilized, occupied by storage buildings related to the Nobleton Feed Mill. 	<p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands have frontage on 10th Concession Road, a major arterial road, providing good accessibility, visibility, and infrastructure potential. - The lands are not encumbered by significant environmental constraints and are not adjacent to employment lands, reducing compatibility concerns. <p>4. Conclusion and Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weston Consulting supports considering the subject lands as an option for redesignation from Nobleton Village Reserve to new community residential area to address the 8-hectare shortfall. - The lands are well-located, compatible with surrounding uses, and suitable for future subdivision. - They request to be informed of future meetings and decisions related to growth areas and express willingness to engage further. <p>Overall, the comments advocate for the inclusion of the subject lands in the future urban expansion of Nobleton to meet growth and housing targets set out in the Official Plan Review.</p>	
20.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	09-Apr-25	Emailed Letter	The document is a professional planning review letter from Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc., dated April 9, 2025, addressed to the Township of King regarding the Official Plan Review for the property at 199 Church Street, Schomberg, known as Lloyds Mill Retirement Home.	<p>Thank you for your submission dated April 9, 2025, regarding the Township of King 2051 Official Plan Review and the proposed development at 199 Church Street, Schomberg (Lloyds Mill Retirement Home).</p> <p>The Township acknowledges the detailed analysis of applicable Provincial policies, including the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement,</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Summary of comments provided:</p> <p>1. Introduction and Subject Property: - Thorstone Consulting was retained by the property owner to provide planning advice related to the Township of King's Growth Management Study and Official Plan Review. - The subject property is on the south side of Church Street at the western edge of the Schomberg settlement area, currently developed with a large single detached dwelling approved for conversion to a retirement home. - The review included analysis of provincial policies, the Township's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, strategic and economic plans, site inspection, and surrounding land use patterns.</p> <p>2. Previous Planning Applications: - An Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment were approved in 1988 allowing a retirement home with specific zoning provisions (floor area max 1,400 sq m, lot coverage max 850 sq m, max 32 persons boarded, setback requirements, and minimum 34 parking spaces). - A Site Plan Application was filed in 2014 to develop the retirement home but was deemed incomplete; technical work including engineered site plans and architectural plans were prepared.</p> <p>3. Township of King Official Plan Policy: - The current Official Plan (adopted 2019, approved 2020) includes site-specific policy 6.12.4 C-SSPA-4 for 199 Church Street allowing</p>	<p>the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, York Region Official Plan, and our current Official Plan and Zoning By-law.</p> <p>We recognize the existing site-specific policy 6.12.4 C-SSPA-4 which permits a retirement home with a maximum of 20 units, subject to a Zoning By-law Amendment and site plan approval, as well as the provisions related to environmental setbacks and servicing from the Village of Schomberg.</p> <p>At this time, the request to remove the maximum unit limitation is not considered appropriate through the Official Plan Review process. There are outstanding concerns regarding how future development on the site would address key planning considerations such as density, building height, and massing. It is recommended that a site-specific development application be submitted to allow for a comprehensive review and public process associated with this request.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>a retirement home with a maximum of 20 units/suites with private bathrooms, subject to zoning amendment and site plan approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental setbacks and extension of water/wastewater services from Schomberg village are permitted under conditions. - All other applicable policies apply. <p>4. Provincial Policy - 2024 Provincial Planning Statement (PPS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township's growth management work includes population and employment forecasting to 2051. - Policy 2.1.3 of the PPS requires sufficient land for a 20-30 year horizon. - Policy 2.1.6 supports complete communities including institutional uses like long-term care homes. - The "Living in King" discussion paper (January 2025) identifies long-term care homes as housing options for the aging population and supports intensification and efficient land use. <p>5. Conclusion and Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thorstone Consulting requests that the site-specific policy 6.12.4 C-SSPA-4 be amended to remove the maximum unit limit of 20 units, which creates financial hardship for the project. - The policy should continue to require zoning by-law amendment and site plan approval. - The size and scale of the retirement home should be determined through a zoning amendment and concurrent site plan submission based on the property's capacity including 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>parking and servicing. - The consultant offers to meet with Township staff to discuss the submission in more detail and provide further input into the Growth Management and Official Plan Review process.</p> <p>In essence, the comments advocate for flexibility in the number of units allowed in the retirement home development at 199 Church Street, aligning with provincial policies supporting long-term care and complete communities, while ensuring proper planning controls through zoning and site plan processes.</p>	
21.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	25-Mar-25	Emailed letter	<p>The comments provided in the document from Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. regarding the Township of King 2051 Official Plan Review for the Wingberry Farms property at 12800 8th Concession can be summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. **Review and Context**: Thorstone Consulting was retained by the property owner to provide professional planning advice related to the Township of King's Growth Management Study and Official Plan Review. They reviewed relevant reports, council directions, and conducted site inspections.</p> <p>2. **Subject Property Description**: Wingberry Farms is an established equestrian operation with training facilities and stables, located adjacent to the Pre-Brick (Boynton) property. It is subject to zoning provisions allowing two additional residences.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding Wingberry Farms at 12800 8th Concession.</p> <p>We acknowledge your engagement in the Official Plan Review process and appreciate the detailed analysis and recommendations provided. The Township recognizes the importance of carefully balancing growth management with the preservation of our rural, cultural, and natural heritage, consistent with our vision for King.</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>3. **Review Activities**: The review included analysis of provincial policies (including the 2024 Provincial Policy Statement), the Township's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, strategic plans, site conditions, surrounding land use, and ongoing Official Plan review documents.</p> <p>4. **Provincial Policy and Official Plan**: The current growth management work forecasts population and employment needs to 2051. The Wingberry Farms property is designated as Nobleton Village Reserve and Village Natural Heritage System in the Official Plan, which applies to lands outside the village boundary and not planned for urban development within the 2031 planning horizon.</p> <p>5. **Natural Heritage Evaluation**: A Significant Woodland identified on the property is a coniferous plantation maintained by Wingberry Farms. The Natural Heritage Evaluation states this plantation is a coniferous monocultural plantation supporting anthropogenic land uses and is not ecologically important per the PPS (MMAH 2020). Thorstone Consulting argues this plantation should not qualify for natural heritage protection and requests its removal from the natural heritage designation and replacement with Village Reserve.</p> <p>6. **Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy**: The Watson report identifies a need for 2,190 additional households in Nobleton from 2024 to 2051 and proposes three</p>	<p>continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Wingberry Farms property.</p> <p>Alternatively, the landowner can also look to advance site-specific applications, such as an Official Plan Amendment supported by the necessary studies and background information, including but not limited to consider redesignating lands from Village Natural Heritage System to Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>options for settlement area boundary expansion, each about 8 hectares.</p> <p>7. **Council Direction**: Council directed staff to analyze options to address the shortfall of Community Area Land in Nobleton through the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>8. **Position and Recommendations**: Thorstone Consulting supports Council's preference for lower density development consistent with existing built-up areas and submits that additional Village Reserve lands, including existing and proposed portions on Wingberry Farms, should be included in the new community designation for settlement area boundary expansion to 2051. This would allow integration with adjacent development (Pre-Brick/Boynton) for a cohesive community structure.</p> <p>9. **Specific Requests**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove the area identified in yellow on Figure 5 from the Village Natural Heritage System. - Identify the yellow area on the subject property as Village Reserve. - Consider existing and proposed Village Reserve lands on the property for settlement area boundary expansion for residential purposes to 2051. <p>10. **Engagement**: The consultant expresses willingness to meet and provide further input and</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>requests to be kept informed of the Official Plan Review process.</p> <p>In summary, the comments advocate for re-designating certain coniferous plantation lands on Wingberry Farms from natural heritage to Village Reserve and including these lands in the settlement area boundary expansion to accommodate residential growth in line with Council's direction for lower density development in Nobleton.</p>	
22.	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	28-Feb-25	Emailed letter	<p>The document is a submission from Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (GSAI), planning consultants for Westlin Farms Inc., regarding the 2051 King Township Official Plan Review for the property at 12480 Weston Road. The key comments and points made in the submission are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands cover 128.47 acres, with 90.74 acres designated Agricultural and 37.73 acres within the Greenbelt Plan. These lands are located in King Township, bordering the City of Vaughan. 2. The lands are part of one of the last "White Belt" areas in King Township, which are undeveloped lands between Ontario's Greenbelt and urban settlement areas, often considered for future urban expansion. 3. The lands are somewhat isolated within King Township, surrounded by Greenbelt lands, but directly abut lands in Vaughan identified for 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding the 2051 King Township Official Plan Review for the lands at 12480 Weston Road. We appreciate the detailed background and analysis provided by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. on behalf of Westlin Farms Inc.</p> <p>The Township has previously identified the lands on the east side of Weston Road that are within the Whitebelt for a future settlement area for Employment Area purposes. However, since the preparation of the Discussion Papers Staff have recognized the benefits of looking at the entirety of the Whitebelt comprehensively.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025, Report to Council and associated proposed Policy Directions identify the need to recognize all the Whitebelt lands as within a site-specific policy area for further study as a new settlement area for Employment Area land uses. This would include the portion of 12480 Weston Road that is outside of the Greenbelt.</p> <p>Should Council endorse these policy directions, the draft amendments to Our King will include the proposed policies and the delineation of the site-specific policy direction in early 2026.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>community expansion, suggesting they should be developed in conjunction with Vaughan's future urban lands rather than remain isolated agricultural land.</p> <p>4. The lands were briefly redesignated from Agricultural to Urban Area and New Community Area by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in November 2022 but were reversed in February 2024 for unknown reasons. They currently remain designated Agricultural in official plans.</p> <p>5. The Region of York Water and Wastewater Master Plan identifies the subject lands as "Urban Area," supporting their potential for urban development.</p> <p>6. The submission references background reports and discussion papers from the 2051 Official Plan Review, including the Watson and Associates "Growth Management and Employment Strategy Report," which recommends considering 32 hectares of White Belt lands near the subject property for employment uses.</p> <p>7. The submission argues that the subject lands at 12480 Weston Road should be considered for Community Area expansion for low-intensity residential development, consistent with the adjacent Vaughan lands, based on connectivity, servicing access, and logical boundary considerations.</p>	<p>collaboration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>8. The new Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) policies from 2024 are cited, outlining criteria for settlement area boundary expansions, which the submission believes the subject lands meet.</p> <p>9. The submission requests that the Official Plan Review process include these lands for Community Area expansion to enable future low-density residential development, ensuring a seamless progression with Vaughan's urban lands and avoiding the creation of an orphaned agricultural parcel.</p> <p>10. The letter offers to meet with Township staff or consultants to discuss the proposal further.</p> <p>In summary, the submission advocates for the redesignation of the 12480 Weston Road lands from Agricultural to Community Area to support future urban expansion aligned with adjacent City of Vaughan plans, based on planning, servicing, and policy considerations.</p>	
23.	Shahbaz Asif and Shazia Shahbaz	17-Mar-25	Email	<p>The comments in the document express strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the 15th Sideroad across Highway 400 and into the countryside of King Township. The key points raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project would significantly alter the character of King Township and negatively impact environmentally sensitive lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt. - The expansion involves over 7 kilometers of 	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the proposed expansion of the 15th Sideroad. The Township of King acknowledges and appreciates your engagement and the concerns you have raised.</p> <p>The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Update 2025 is concurrent to the Official Plan Update. The OP update is intended to align with the vision and objectives of the TMP Update 2025. In the 2022 York Region Transportation Master Plan (YTMP) a significant shift in regional priorities for King Township included removing a previous reference to widening the 15th Sideroad and its associated Highway 400 interchange. Instead, the updated plan concentrates on optimizing</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>road, expropriating private land and requiring a costly new bridge over Highway 400, which would place a financial burden on taxpayers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed expansion contradicts King Township's commitment to environmental preservation, as the area is located in the Natural Core Area of the Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt, which are vital ecological resources. - Extending the road would cause irreversible environmental harm. - A more practical and cost-effective alternative exists: improving a 1.6-kilometer stretch of road with an established bridge over Highway 400 in Vaughan, which would serve as a viable truck bypass aligned with the planned Nobleton Employment Area. - This alternative is closer to industrial zones, more convenient for truckers, reduces traffic in King's downtown core, and is less costly. - Highway 413 is proposed to be built just south of this 1.6-km stretch, with a proposed interchange at Highway 27, potentially serving as a major truck route between Highway 413 and Highway 400. - There is a possibility that the Ministry of Transportation may not fund the Highway 400 bridge if Highway 413 becomes the primary truck route. - The commenter urges reconsideration of the proposal in favor of more sustainable and fiscally responsible solutions that align with King Township's values of environmental stewardship and responsible growth. 	<p>existing infrastructure and advancing strategic improvements along the King-Vaughan Townline between Bathurst Street and Weston Road, including potential interchange enhancements at Highway 400.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				The comment concludes with a request for the council to focus on these alternatives and expresses anticipation for a response.	
24.	Dentons Canada LLP	10-Mar-25	Emailed letter	<p>The comments provided by Dentons Canada LLP on behalf of their client, Malcolm Bridges, regarding the new King Township Official Plan ("King OP") can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Client and Property Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The client owns lands at 15435 7th Concession, Concession 6, Part Lot 22 in the Township of King. - The lands are 4.37 hectares and contain two separate detached dwellings, each with individual driveways and private servicing. 2. Request for Policy Inclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The client requests the Township to create two separate parcels of land, one for each dwelling, through a technical lot division. - This division is to reflect existing circumstances and would not involve any new development or site alteration. - The client seeks inclusion of a site-specific policy in the new King OP to allow this technical severance. 3. Land Designation and Zoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are designated as Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area and are zoned accordingly under current and amended zoning by-laws. - Lot 1 is approximately 2.06 ha with a dwelling 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 15435 7th Concession.</p> <p>15435 7th Concession is located within the Natural Heritage System of the Oak Ridges Moraine and as such is subject to the policies of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). While the PPS 2024 provides a framework for considering a technical severance, it is important to note that in accordance with the PPS 2024 Provincial Plans, such as the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, build upon the policy foundation of the PPS, and take precedence over the policies of the PPS to the extent of any conflict, except where the relevant legislation provides otherwise.</p> <p>As such, the proposed lot creation at 15435 7th Concession should be considered in the context of the policies of the ORMCP which does not have a framework for a technical severance. Instead, lot creation would be required to conform to the policies of Section 32 of the ORMCP.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to review the proposed lot creation in the context of the policies of the ORMCP. As the Official Plan is already consistent with these policies of the ORMCP, if the proposed severance application is consistent with the policies of the ORMCP then an amendment or site-specific policy area to Our King would not be required to facilitate the proposed lot creation. However, if the proposed severance is not consistent with these policies of the ORMCP then the Project Team would not be able to support a site-specific policy to Our King as the Official Plan is required to conform to the ORMCP.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>built before the 1930s, including a garage, storage, septic system, and a 122-meter well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 2 is approximately 2.31 ha with a dwelling built in 1972, a septic system, and a 61-meter well. <p>4. Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (PPS 2024):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.3.3 of PPS 2024 permits severances for legal or technical reasons. - The lands are outside the Prime Agricultural area, and the lot adjustment is technical to recognize existing dwellings functioning independently since the 1930s and 1970s. - Each dwelling has separate servicing and driveways, and the severance would result in two conveyable parcels. <p>5. King OP Policy Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current King OP allows creation of new lots under limited circumstances, including Countryside Site Specific Policy Area 5. - The policy allows two existing detached dwellings on the subject lands to be divided into two separately conveyable parcels, subject to zoning amendments and consent to sever. <p>6. Summary and Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The client requests the Township to include the proposed site-specific policy language in the new King OP. - The severance is technical, with no physical changes or impact on the neighborhood. - The proposed amendments would legally 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>recognize the existing dwellings. - The client looks forward to discussions with Township staff on these proposed revisions.</p> <p>In essence, the comments seek formal recognition and policy inclusion in the King OP to allow a technical lot division of the existing property into two parcels, each containing one of the two existing dwellings, without any new development or alteration to the land.</p>	
25.	Nanda Maliakkal	01-Mar-25	Email	<p>The comment in the document expresses concern about a proposal for the 15th Sideroad extension to handle transportation truck traffic. The document is not supportive of the project due to the anticipated destruction and encroachment on protected greenbelt areas. They urge consideration of alternative solutions in collaboration with the Ward 3 representative and emphasize the importance of preserving the health and wellbeing of current and future generations by keeping King City clean and unspoiled.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The importance of protecting natural heritage features and maintaining the integrity of the Greenbelt, consistent with Provincial policies and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan is acknowledged.</p> <p>Any proposed road extension undergoes a comprehensive review process, including environmental assessments and consultation with the community, to minimize impacts on natural heritage.</p> <p>The Transportation Discussion Paper and Natural Heritage Discussion Paper prepared for the Our King 2051 Official Plan Review both acknowledge the importance of balancing infrastructure needs with environmental protection.</p> <p>While the 2016 York Region Transportation Master Plan previously identified the 15th Sideroad extension as a potential truck route with a Highway 400 interchange, the 2022 update removed this proposal, shifting focus to alternative regional roads such as Bathurst Street and King-Vaughan Road to accommodate truck traffic and bypass village cores.</p> <p>The Township's 2025 Transportation Master Plan Update is currently ongoing and explores other options, recognizing community concerns about environmental impacts and the need to preserve King's rural character and natural heritage.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>The Natural Heritage Discussion Paper reinforces this by emphasizing the protection of Greenbelt lands, ecological connectivity, and the health of sensitive natural systems. It outlines preliminary policy directions that discourage development in flood-prone and ecologically significant areas, and promotes road ecology best practices to reduce wildlife mortality and landscape fragmentation. A detailed Natural Heritage Background Study is also underway, and will be presented to Council in December 2025 concurrently with proposed policy directions to natural heritage policies.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p> <p>Thank you again for your comment.</p>
26.	William and Winifred Stott Winsong Farm	Mar 4 2025	Emailed Letter	<p>The comments express strong opposition to routing transport trucks through the 15th Sideroad, which runs through environmentally protected areas like the Oak Ridges Moraine and the Greenbelt. Concerns include damage to ecosystems, altered water drainage, contamination of nearby water bodies, increased traffic, higher speeds, dangerous driving, and higher accident rates. The commenters value the rural ambiance and protection of these lands and urge the township to consider alternative solutions that do not compromise protected countryside.</p> <p>Suggested alternatives include:</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed submission regarding the proposed goods movement network and concerns related to the 15th Sideroad corridor.</p> <p>The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Update 2025 is concurrent to the Official Plan Update. The OP update is intended to align with the vision and objectives of the TMP Update 2025. In the 2022 York Region Transportation Master Plan (YTMP) a significant shift in regional priorities for King Township included removing a previous reference to widening the 15th Sideroad and its associated Highway 400 interchange. Instead, the updated plan concentrates on optimizing existing infrastructure and advancing strategic improvements along the King-Vaughan Townline between Bathurst Street and Weston Road, including potential interchange enhancements at Highway 400.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Widening King Road, which already has four lanes and is better equipped for traffic. - Waiting to observe the impact of the Ford Hwy 413 plan on nearby areas before proceeding. - Collaborating with Vaughan to improve King/Vaughan Road. - Exploring other options that avoid protected rural areas. <p>Overall, the comments view the proposed commercial truck routing as unnecessary, harmful, and unclear in its necessity for the rural township.</p>	
27.	Nancy Pannia	05-Mar-25	Email	<p>The comments in the document express support for the Official Plan and the proposed redesignation of the property at 6610 King Road, Nobleton. Nancy Pannia, writing on behalf of her family who owns the property, indicates that they have been actively following the planning process, attending virtual town meetings, and understanding the community impact. They support transitioning the land use to meet Nobleton's additional residential needs and will continue to engage with the development process.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 6610 King Road.</p> <p>Through the Reports to Council in February and June of this year, Council provided Staff with direction to pursue the location options in southwest Nobleton as the primary locations for new residential and employment development in Nobleton to address the Community Area and Employment Area shortfall. A comprehensive Concept Plan for southwest Nobleton has been drafted as part of Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, which was released for public review and comment in September 2025.</p> <p>While Option 1 is currently not identified for re-designation as part of the plan for the southwest quadrant, the policy directions proposed through the Discussion Paper also recognize the need for a comprehensive secondary plan for the entire Village Reserve. This would provide an opportunity to look at the appropriate long-term land uses in the Reserve, beyond the 2051 planning horizon. Should Council endorse these directions, the secondary planning exercise would occur following the completion of the Official Plan Review.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					The Project Team encourages your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review, and thanks you for your participation.
28.	Leo Palozzi Gala Developments	2/27/2025	Email	The comment provided in the document is from Leo Palozzi, Senior Manager of Planning and Development at Gala Developments. He states that the land at 3600 Lloydtown-Aurora Rd, Kettleby, ON, should be designated as Employment land in the Official Plan. The rationale is that the location is strategically near major highways (Highway 400 to the east and Highway 9 to the north), making it suitable for employment purposes. Additionally, he suggests that the Township of King should invest in the necessary capital infrastructure to support the development of Employment land, as it would provide needed jobs for the Township.	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the land municipally identified as 3600 Lloydtown Aurora Rd.</p> <p>The Township acknowledges the strategic location of this property due to its proximity to Highway 400 and the highway interchange at Lloydtown Aurora Road and Highway 400.</p> <p>The property is located within the Countryside Area designation of the Oak Ridges Moraine, and is not within a Hamlet or a Settlement Area (Village). The property is also within a prime agricultural area. As such, the current Provincial policy framework would not permit the property to be used as an Employment Area in accordance with the Planning Act and PPS 2024 definition. However, there are opportunities for the property to accommodate agriculture-related uses, such as farm related industrial and farm related commercial uses (farm feed and supply store, crop storage, farmers market, etc.) which are currently permitted by the Official Plan for the property. A site-specific zoning by-law amendment application to facilitate one of these uses can be advanced at any time under King's current Official Plan policies.</p> <p>We appreciate your interest in contributing to King's economic development and encourage you to engage with Township Development Planning Staff to explore opportunities for this property further.</p>
29.	York Region Federation of Agriculture	28-Feb-25	Letter	The York Region Federation of Agriculture (YRFA) provided comments on the King Township Official Plan Review 2025 Phase Two Discussion Papers, focusing on "Living in King," "Working in King," and "Moving and Connecting in King." Key points from their comments include:	<p>The Township of King thanks the York Region Federation of Agriculture (YRFA) for their thoughtful and comprehensive comments on the Official Plan Review 2025 Phase Two Discussion Papers: Living in King; Working in King; and Moving and Connecting in King.</p> <p>The Township appreciates YRFA's support for policies that promote efficient land use for balanced growth along with a vision to protect</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for policies promoting efficient land use that limit settlement expansion onto agricultural lands, encourage denser housing, mixed-use areas, walkability, and reduced car dependency. 2. Endorsement of "complete communities" with a mix of housing, employment, commercial, transportation, and public services in close proximity to support well-functioning urban spaces that complement rural areas. 3. Support for greater housing diversity and intensification targets within the township, especially in areas like Nobleton, to reduce pressure on farmland and improve housing affordability. 4. Strong backing for policies that expand mixed-use commercial development within urban boundaries, requiring mixed-use components in developments to reduce settlement boundary expansions and road pressure. 5. Opposition to redesignating Whitebelt lands for non-agricultural uses, emphasizing the importance of preserving these agriculturally desirable lands for continued farming and economic benefit. 6. Support for policies that maintain commercial uses within settlement boundaries through 	<p>prime agricultural areas and the rural economy as outlined in the Official Plan.</p> <p>We share YRFA's endorsement of complete communities that integrate diverse housing types, employment, commercial, and transportation options within close proximity. The Township is committed to increasing housing diversity and intensification targets, particularly in Village cores such as Nobleton, to support affordability and reduce pressure on agricultural lands. We also recognize the importance of mixed-use commercial development within urban boundaries to enhance local employment opportunities and reduce the need for greenfield expansions.</p> <p>The Township acknowledges YRFA's position on the Whitebelt lands. While a portion of the Whitebelt lands are designated prime agricultural area under Provincial policy, the lands are located outside of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Areas, presenting one of the few locations for potential urban growth in the Township. In addition, the lands are located immediately adjacent to the settlement area boundary in Vaughan, with the lands on Vaughan's side of the municipal boundary designated for both Community and Employment Area uses.</p> <p>As discussed in Discussion Paper 6: Economic Development and Employment, concentrating employment uses within the Whitebelt long-term would support compatible land use with the land use designations in Vaughan, and would provide an opportunity to diversify the Township's tax base. Through the preliminary policy directions, the Whitebelt is proposed to be identified as a Countryside Site-Specific Policy Area, for further study as a new settlement area for the Township for Employment Area purposes. Should these directions be endorsed by Council, while the Study and secondary planning work is underway the lands would remain in their current</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>mixed-use policies and oppose greenfield commercial expansions on agricultural lands.</p> <p>7. Advocacy for policies that reduce road pressure, enable safe movement of farm equipment and personal vehicles, and promote efficient transportation through transit, active transportation, and mixed-use areas.</p> <p>8. Encouragement for the township to consider farm equipment width in road reconstruction to accommodate agricultural needs.</p> <p>9. Support for updated provincial policies allowing greater density around Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) and the development of a Goods Movement Network to facilitate efficient movement of goods and reduce road pressure.</p> <p>Overall, the YRFA emphasizes balancing growth and intensification with the protection and sustainability of agricultural lands and rural communities, supporting policies that foster connectivity, affordability, and efficient land use while preserving farming viability.</p>	<p>designations (Rural and Agricultural) to allowed for their continued use for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>In terms of your comments regarding transportation and the safe movement of farm equipment, we thank you for your comments and have shared them with our Public Works team to inform policy updates to the Township’s Transportation Master Plan. The policy recommendations and updates to the Transportation Master Plan will also inform updates to the transportation policies of the Official Plan.</p> <p>The Township values YRFA’s ongoing engagement to ensure a sustainable, vibrant, and inclusive future for King Township’s rural and urban communities alike.</p>
30.	Jack Campbell and Family	26-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Jack Campbell and Family regarding King's new Official Plan focus on three main areas: Residential, Commercial, and Employment.</p> <p>Residential: - Support for densified residential development with mid-rise "missing middle" housing types, citing examples in Schomberg that maintain</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township recognizes the need for “missing middle” housing types, particularly the need to have varied built forms and housing typologies. This can help with meeting housing needs, while also providing transition in built form between higher density development in the Village Cores, and low-rise established neighbourhoods. The Discussion Papers on Intensification, and Housing (Discussion Papers</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>affordability and heritage character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about the demolition of modest bungalows and wartime houses being replaced by large single-family homes that remove vegetation and have minimal setbacks. Suggest incentives to convert some single-family lots to duplex or triplex units with architectural controls to fit neighborhood character. - Noted absence of proposed senior or assisted living units in King, recommending appropriate zoning and incentives to build these facilities, possibly using surplus church properties. - Concern about gentrification and loss of affordable rental apartments in Schomberg's downtown core due to renovations. <p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion to accommodate new commercial development within existing village cores, redeveloping properties to include mixed uses in multi-story buildings. - Criticism of single-story retail plazas that leave upper space unused, missing opportunities for mixed-use development with offices and residential apartments. Advocates for zoning/approval conditions to encourage this. <p>Employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern over limited employment land development despite improved tax base; critique of a proposal to rezone a property outside Schomberg village boundary from agricultural to commercial, arguing it is inappropriate and suggesting better locations closer to existing 	<p>3 and 4, respectively) provide policy directions to further support variation in built form, missing middle housing, seniors housing, and new definitions and policies around affordable, attainable and rental housing. However, in terms of architectural control and incentives for retaining existing dwellings, there are limited opportunities for the Township as a result of recent changes to the Planning Act. Nevertheless, the Project Team will continue to explore these avenues as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted.</p> <p>In terms of commercial development, the Employment Land Strategy has applied an intensification rate to existing commercial developments to recognize that these areas should intensify over time rather than staying as single-storey retail plazas. The proposed policy directions in the Discussion Paper also recognize the direction of the PPS 2024 to encourage the redevelopment of underutilized commercial plazas and commercial spaces to accommodate mixed use developments.</p> <p>In terms of the proposed settlement area boundary expansion for Employment uses for Schomberg, this location option has been considered due to its frontage on Highway 9, and its proximity to existing municipal servicing in Schomberg. The landowner has also expressed interest in the lands being used for Employment purposes, which benefits the Township as should the lands be re-designated, there would be the potential for the employment uses to be developed in a timely manner rather than remaining vacant. The location is also beneficial as it would primarily route any potential truck traffic along Highway 9, rather than along Highway 27 and through the Village of Schomberg.</p> <p>However, the Project Team recognizes the challenges associated with this proposed settlement area boundary expansion due to the presence of potential natural heritage features, and its inclusion within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt. A Natural Heritage</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>commercial/industrial areas with accessible services.</p> <p>- Opposition to converting employment-zoned land to residential, citing the example of the former Boynton farm in Nobleton, emphasizing the importance of protecting employment land to avoid perpetuating a bedroom community.</p> <p>- Disagreement with proposed commercial/industrial developments near Hwy 400 adjacent to Laskay, citing concerns about urban sprawl extending beyond the Greenbelt.</p> <p>Overall, the comments emphasize balanced growth that preserves community character, supports affordable and diverse housing options, protects employment lands, and encourages smart mixed-use commercial development within existing village cores.</p>	<p>Study is currently underway for the lands, and consideration of the settlement area boundary expansion will be subject to a future report to Council, targeted for December 2025.</p> <p>Finally, in terms of Laskay, the delineation of the Hamlet boundary for 25 Laskay Mills Drive was deferred through the last Official Plan Review. Historically, the lands were recognized as being within the Hamlet, but the extent of the lands were not delineated under the Greenbelt Plan. As such, should the lands be included within the Hamlet boundary, it is not an extension or expansion of the Hamlet, rather a formal delineation and confirmation that the lands are within the Hamlet, in accordance with Greenbelt Plan policies.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review, and thanks you for your participation.</p>
31.	Grace Yu	27-Feb-25	Email	<p>The comments provided by Grace Yu, a resident of the Kingscross community, express serious concerns about the potential impact of new residential development (Mansions of King at 2710 King Road) on well water quality. Since 2017, the commenter has been actively involved in raising issues related to well water protection, including risks of damage, shortage, and contamination during and after construction. The comments highlights ongoing well water monitoring due to high risks of water degradation and the anxiety caused by potential health impacts.</p> <p>The comments refers to the Official Plan (Page 8-5, Section 8.2.2.8), which prohibits</p>	<p>Thank you for your continued participation in the Official Plan update. The Project Team recognizes there may be site-specific circumstances where it may be appropriate to consider flexible servicing policies while ensuring alignment with Provincial policies, infrastructure capacity, environmental stewardship, and financial sustainability. Your comments have also been shared with the Township's Public Works Department for their consideration as they update King's Water and Wastewater Master Plan. Updates to this Master Plan will also inform policy updates to the Our King Official Plan.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review as policy is drafted.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>construction or expansion of partial services unless addressing serious health or environmental concerns. The comments request that this clause be elaborated to support residents who face health and environmental concerns and require partial municipal water service. The submission outlines specific conditions under which partial municipal water service should be considered, including being under well water monitoring, proximity to new large development sites, adjacency to existing partial public services, infeasibility of acquiring full service, and suitability of site conditions for long-term service provision without negative impacts.</p> <p>Overall, the commenter hopes the township will provide municipal water service to alleviate residents' concerns about well water safety related to the new development.</p>	
32.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The document is a professional planning advice and recommendation letter from Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc., retained by Advanced Construction Techniques Ltd. (ACT) regarding the Township of King's 2051 Official Plan Review. The key points and comments provided are summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. **Purpose and Subject Property**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The objective is to ensure the subject property at 3935 Lloydtown Aurora Road is properly recognized in Township planning instruments and land use regulations. - The property is approximately 3.92 hectares 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding 3935 Lloydtown Aurora Road. We appreciate your interest and contribution to the Official Plan Review. However, the Official Plan Review is intended to address broad, Township-wide planning matters rather than site-specific changes to recognize existing legal non-conforming uses.</p> <p>We encourage you to submit a site-specific application which would allow for a more detailed review of your proposal in the context of its unique location, land use, and planning considerations.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>(9.6 acres) and located south of Aurora Lloydtown Road, near Highway 400 interchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The review included policy analysis, site inspection, and review of zoning and site plan agreements. <p>2. **Policy Review**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewed relevant policies including the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Township of King Official Plan (“Our King”), and York Region Official Plan. - The 2024 PPS allows planning for employment areas beyond 25 years, with a horizon of 20-30 years. - The Region of York’s Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) assigns residential and employment projections to 2051. - The Township’s Corporate Strategic Plan (2023-2026) prioritizes complete communities and protecting employment uses. - The King Economic Development Strategy (2018) highlights the need to attract business investment and address the lack of suitable employment lands. <p>3. **Official Plan Policies**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township’s Official Plan emphasizes increasing local job opportunities, diversifying the economy, and capitalizing on proximity to Highway 400 and the Greater Golden Horseshoe. - The subject lands are near the Lloydtown 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Aurora Road and Highway 400 interchange, aligning with the Township’s economic and environmental goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The property is designated as “Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area” under Schedule E – Countryside Land Use. <p>4. **Existing Use and Zoning**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The property was zoned for industrial use since 1976, specifically for pre-cast concrete products. - A 2009 Site Plan Development Agreement allowed expansion of industrial use including storage and outside storage. - Policies allow existing uses legally established before November 15, 2001, to continue and expand or convert to similar uses, subject to ecological impact considerations and approvals. <p>5. **Recommendations and Requests**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The letter requests that the Official Plan recognize the subject property as supporting an existing industrial use with associated outside storage and office uses. - It proposes designation of the lands as “Existing Rural Employment” on Schedule E. - The policy should allow expansion or change to similar industrial uses with site plan approval and natural heritage evaluation. - The approach aligns with provincial policy, Township strategic goals, and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan objectives. 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>6. **Closing**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The consultant expresses willingness to meet and provide further input. - Requests to be added to the Township's distribution list for updates on the Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy and Official Plan Review. <p>In summary, the comments support the recognition and protection of the existing industrial use on the subject property within the Township's planning framework, advocating for a policy designation that allows continued and potentially expanded employment uses consistent with provincial and local policies.</p>	
33.	Sandra Calla	24-Feb-25	Email	<p>The comment from Sandra Calla expresses interest in the future development plans for Nobleton, specifically asking whether there are any plans to establish a Catholic and/or public high school in Nobleton. She mentions having three young children and would like to know if a Catholic high school closer than Aurora is planned for the area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding future educational facilities in Nobleton.</p> <p>Through the Official Plan Review, the York Catholic District School Board has noted they are pursuing a Catholic Secondary School site within the proposed development at 12805 Highway 27 (OP-2022-01, Z-2022-05, 19T-22K01). This site has been identified as a possibility to provide future accommodation for students within the Nobleton and surrounding areas.</p> <p>It is encouraged to connect directly with the York Catholic District School Board and the York Region District School Board for the most current information on school planning and potential future developments in the area.</p>
34.	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments from Humphries Planning Group Inc., representing Iron Construction and Development Inc., express support for the staff recommendation in the 2051 King Township</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 25 Laskay Mills Drive.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 10: King's Hamlets, provides an overview of the policies for King's Hamlets, including the Hamlet of Laskay. In terms of</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Official Plan Review, specifically Item 21. They agree that the study of land uses in the area known as 25 Laskay Mills Drive should not be limited to dry employment uses only. The property, approximately 18.6 hectares in size and located in the southwest quadrant of Highway 400 and King Road within the Hamlet of Laskay, is designated as Hamlet Commercial and Hamlet Rural Area. The group highlights the property's advantageous location near a full interchange at Highway 400 and suggests that a range of land uses should be considered. They request that, in addition to industrial uses, the property also be considered for residential land uses as part of the ongoing Official Plan Review process.</p>	<p>25 Laskay Mills Drive, it recognizes that the delineation of the Hamlet boundary was deferred by York Region for this property through the approval of the Our King Official Plan by the Region in 2020. As such, the Township will be looking to make a decision on the Hamlet boundary for these lands through the current Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes policy directions to incorporate 25 Laskay Mills Drive into the Hamlet boundary of Laskay, and provides direction to guide the development of site-specific policy areas for the lands to facilitate their redesignation for Hamlet Employment and Hamlet Residential purposes.</p> <p>The Project Team appreciates the preparation of the Conceptual Plan by the commenter. Should Council endorse the directions outlined in the Discussion Paper and October 27, 2025 Report to Council, the Project Team will continue to work with the commenter and landowner to further discuss the delineation of the lands, appropriate land use designations, and protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system.</p>
35.	John Bartella	Feb 24 2025	Presentation slides	<p>The comments from the Diana Hilda Community regarding the 2051 Official Plan Review for Employment Lands in Nobleton can be summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. Community Background: - Diana Hilda is the southernmost point of Nobleton, bordering the City of Vaughan. - Residents have lived there for over 50 years and feel the community is often forgotten. - The community actively opposes Highway 413, fights illegal land use, and works with York Region to improve road safety.</p> <p>2. Opposition to Employment Lands Options #1</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding the neighbourhood at Diana Drive and Hilda Road.</p> <p>The location options that were identified in the February 2025 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified two options for potential Employment Areas, both in the southern portion of Nobleton to align with future transportation networks, including King Vaughan Road and the future 413. Locating Employment Area lands further north in Nobleton may require truck traffic to infiltrate through the Village, causing increased truck traffic in the Village Cores and existing neighbourhoods. This would present both land use compatibility concerns, traffic and transportation issues and has the potential for noise, vibration, odour and safety concerns. Nobleton also does not currently have any Employment Area lands, so</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>and #2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The community opposes designating employment lands for industrial use that encroach on residential areas. - They highlight ongoing illegal land use issues along King Vaughan Road and Concession 10. - They express concern that industrial businesses surrounding the community (especially option #2) would destroy the neighborhood. - They emphasize the right to live without noise and air pollution. <p>3. Alternatives Suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing employment lands in Nobleton, where expansion is possible, should be considered instead. - These existing lands do not encroach on residential communities, such as the northwest corner of King Road and Concession 10, and Hwy 27 north of 18th Sideroad. <p>4. Community Vision and Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diana Hilda is designated as Estate Residential and desires connection to the Nobleton Village Core. - They want land around their community reserved for residential use to maintain community identity and future generations' sense of belonging. - The current proposal for employment lands around Diana Hilda is seen as severing the community from the village core and neglecting community needs. 	<p>identifying new Employment Areas for Nobleton is an important component of this Official Plan Review.</p> <p>In order to provide clarity and increased certainty in future land use both within and beyond the 2051 planning horizon the Township has prepared a Concept Plan for Southwest Nobleton that is included in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve. This Concept Plan builds off the Location Options that were presented to Council through the Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy, and set out proposed future land uses for all lands within southwest Nobleton.</p> <p>The lands surrounding Diana Drive and Hilda Road are proposed to be designated for Residential and Deferred Residential purposes. Residential lands are forecast to be built out over the 2051 planning horizon, with Deferred Residential lands being contemplated for residential uses at a future date, beyond the 2051 horizon.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025 Report to Council seeks Council's endorsement of the Concept Plan, and direction to develop policies for a Site-Specific Policy Area for south-west Nobleton that aligns with the Concept Plan. This will provide a framework for a future secondary plan for southwest Nobleton in order to undertake the necessary land use and infrastructure planning to enable growth in this quadrant.</p> <p>Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The community strongly encourages the council to reject the current proposal and seek alternatives aligned with existing employment lands that have room to expand.</p> <p>Overall, the Diana Hilda Community is advocating for protecting their residential neighborhood from industrial encroachment, addressing illegal land use, and preserving community integrity by focusing employment land expansion in appropriate existing areas.</p>	
36.	Harry Littler	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments in the document are from Harry Littler, a landowner in King, Ontario, regarding a meeting about the official plan for Nobleton on February 24, 2025. Harry requests that his 75-acre property be considered for Official Plan status as Village lands. He raises four main concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The water for the new development will be drawn from the same aquifer as his land and horse farm. 2. Parts of his land are designated as Heritage forests where he has plantation trees for future harvesting. 3. He requests road allowance access to his property for services related to the new 456-house development adjacent to his lot. 4. He inquires how his manure pit on the lot line will affect the proposed housing development. <p>He also asks for guidance on how to apply to have his property added to the official plan and to address his concerns.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding your property in Nobleton and your interest in its consideration within the Township of King's Official Plan (OP) update.</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for your property.</p> <p>Alternatively, you can also look to advance site-specific applications, such as an Official Plan Amendment supported by the necessary studies and background information, including but not limited to natural heritage evaluations, and ecological studies to consider redesignating lands from Village Natural Heritage System to Nobleton Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>In terms of your concerns regarding the development application for 12805 Highway 27, water servicing and road allowance requests related to new developments are planned for through the detailed subdivision planning. Water servicing is carefully planned and phased in coordination with York Region to ensure sustainable use of aquifers and water resources. Further, requests for road allowance access related to new developments are subject to detailed review through the subdivision and site plan approval processes.</p> <p>The potential effects of existing agricultural operations, including manure pits, on adjacent land uses are addressed through land use compatibility policies and provincial guidelines and are assessed through the development application process.</p> <p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>
37.	J. Bruce Craig	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments in the document express concerns about the proposed expansion of commercial land at the Hwy 400 and King Road location in King City. The key points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Challenges with the proposed location include poor integration with the existing community, isolation by natural heritage lands, lack of municipal services and transit, and potential high car dependency. The commenter questions the cost-effectiveness and benefits to King City residents. 2. The commenter suggests exploring more efficient and cost-effective alternatives for commercial expansion, such as: 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We acknowledge your concerns related to connectivity, natural heritage constraints, municipal servicing, transit availability, and potential car dependency associated with the identified potential expansion to the King City Settlement Area boundary for proposed commercial land south of King Road and east side of Highway 400.</p> <p>The Phase 2 Growth Management Strategy and Employment Lands Strategy Report dated Feb 10, 2025, prepared by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. for King Township identifies that King City is forecast to experience a shortfall of commercial land by 2051. While intensification of existing commercial areas is encouraged and will play a role in accommodating future growth, it alone is insufficient to meet the projected demand. As a result, the Strategy recommends</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- Adding a second level to existing commercial buildings at Coppa's plaza, which is currently under-utilized and well-serviced, benefiting new residential developments nearby.</p> <p>- Expanding commercial uses in the core area of King City, incorporating mixed-use developments near transit and residential units to create a healthy, walkable neighborhood with diverse commercial amenities.</p> <p>3. There is concern about expanding settlement areas into the Greenbelt Countryside, emphasizing the need to uphold provincial plans and maintain settlement boundaries while promoting healthy, complete, and efficient communities.</p> <p>Overall, the submission advocates for more integrated, transit-accessible, and sustainable commercial development options rather than expanding into less connected and environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>exploring a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) for King City to accommodate additional commercial land needs.</p> <p>The Township is in the process of undertaking a Natural Heritage Study to determine if natural heritage features are present on the lands, and to assess their suitability in accommodating employment uses. The results of the Natural Heritage Study will be presented to Council in December 2025.</p>
38.	Innovative Planning Solutions	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The document is a letter from Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) addressed to the Township of King Council, dated February 24, 2025. It responds to items related to growth management, employment land strategies, and the official plan review for the Township of King, specifically concerning a 30.47-hectare parcel of land known as the "Subject Lands" located in the rural community of Laskay, Ontario.</p> <p>Key points from the comments include:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 25 Laskay Mills Drive.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 10: King's Hamlets, provides an overview of the policies for King's Hamlets, including the Hamlet of Laskay. In terms of 25 Laskay Mills Drive, it recognizes that the delineation of the Hamlet boundary was deferred by York Region for this property through the approval of the Our King Official Plan by the Region in 2020. As such, the Township will be looking to make a decision on the Hamlet boundary for these lands through the current Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes policy directions to incorporate 25 Laskay Mills Drive into the Hamlet boundary of Laskay, and provides</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>1. **Location and Context**: The Subject Lands are rectangular, located west of Highway 400 and east of an existing residential subdivision, with frontage on Highway 400 and access via Laskay Mills Drive cul-de-sac. Surrounding land uses include residential subdivisions, rural, and agricultural areas.</p> <p>2. **Planning History**: The landowners requested the inclusion of the Subject Lands into the Hamlet of Laskay boundary through the Official Plan Review (OPR) process. York Region deferred the lands under the Township's Official Plan. A Pre-Application Consultation meeting was held with Township staff to discuss development options.</p> <p>3. **Policy Framework**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (PPS 2024) supports efficient land use, infrastructure optimization, active transportation, and transit-supportive development. - PPS 2024 policies allow for settlement area boundary expansions, considering factors like land use needs, infrastructure capacity, agricultural impact, and phased urban development. - The Subject Lands fall within the Greenbelt Plan as Protected Countryside, which includes goals for agricultural viability, environmental protection, and settlement areas. - York Region Official Plan 2022 (YROP) policies are now superseded by the Township of King Official Plan due to legislative changes. 	<p>direction to guide the development of site-specific policy areas for the lands to facilitate their redesignation for Hamlet Employment and Hamlet Residential purposes.</p> <p>The Project Team appreciates the preparation of the Conceptual Plan by the commenter. Should Council endorse the directions outlined in the Discussion Paper and October 27, 2025 Report to Council, the Project Team will continue to work with the commenter and landowner to further discuss the delineation of the lands, appropriate land use designations, and protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The Township of King Official Plan (1970) still applies to the Subject Lands due to site-specific deferrals by York Region.</p> <p>4. **Zoning and Land Use**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Subject Lands are split-zoned as Greenbelt Natural Heritage, Agricultural, and Open Space, with a site-specific exception requiring a zoning by-law amendment for development. - The Laskay Secondary Hamlet Plan designates the lands as Hamlet Residential, Hazard Lands, and Rural. - An Official Plan Amendment would be needed to include the Subject Lands in the Hamlet Settlement Area (HSLA). <p>5. **Proposed Development**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPS proposes extending Laskay Mills Drive and developing a 9.38-hectare Residential Block and an 11.09-hectare Mixed Use Block (commercial, employment, residential, live-work). - The proposal supports creating a complete community with a mix of housing and employment uses, addressing local and regional housing needs. - Environmental features will be studied further to support planning applications. <p>6. **Comments on Township Discussion Papers**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The landowner supports lifting the prohibition on major development in Hamlets through the 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>OPR process to enable growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They request inclusion of the Subject Lands in the Laskay Hamlet boundary and support a mix of residential and non-residential uses. - Employment uses are proposed to support the existing Hamlet and surrounding rural/agricultural areas. - The landowner acknowledges the need for private water and wastewater servicing until public infrastructure is available. <p>7. **Conclusion and Next Steps**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The landowner requests that the Township consider the IPS Conceptual Block Plan during the OPR process to facilitate the expansion of the Hamlet boundary and mixed land uses. - IPS commits to ongoing participation in the OPR process and looks forward to further dialogue and review. <p>Overall, the comments advocate for the inclusion of the Subject Lands into the Hamlet of Laskay Settlement Area through the Township's Official Plan Review, supporting a mix of residential, commercial, and employment uses to create a complete and sustainable community aligned with provincial and municipal planning policies.</p>	
39.	Paul Tommasino	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments from Paul Tommasino express disapproval of the proposed future growth plan for his community in Nobleton. While acknowledging the necessity of growth, he opposes the new plan because it does not allow for the continuation of housing development in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The location options that were identified in the February 2025 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified two options for potential Employment Areas, both in the southern portion of Nobleton</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>his subdivision, particularly on the east side. He suggests that commercial and employment development would be more appropriate at the corners of Highway 27 and King Vaughan Line. He is open to options on the 10th concession but emphasizes that the community should be connected and adjoining other communities, rather than being isolated by a street. He stresses the importance of the community being part of a larger connected community rather than feeling separated.</p>	<p>to align with future transportation networks, including King Vaughan Road and the future 413.</p> <p>However, we understand the land use compatibility concerns between residential uses, and future Employment Areas. In order to provide clarity and increased certainty in future land use both within and beyond the 2051 planning horizon the Township has prepared a Concept Plan for Southwest Nobleton that is included in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve. This Concept Plan builds off the Location Options that were presented to Council through the Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy, and set out proposed future land uses for all lands within southwest Nobleton.</p> <p>Employment Area uses have been reoriented to be along 10th Concession, with a Supportive Employment Area and Deferred Residential Area providing transition between the employment uses and existing residential uses closer to Highway 27.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025, Report to Council seeks Council's endorsement of the Concept Plan, and direction to develop policies for a Site-Specific Policy Area for south-west Nobleton that aligns with the Concept Plan. This will provide a framework for a future secondary plan for southwest Nobleton in order to undertake the necessary land use and infrastructure planning to enable growth in this quadrant.</p> <p>Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>
40.	Fandor Homes	01-Jan-25	Letter	<p>The comments in the document focus on the residential and employment land expansion options in Nobleton as outlined in the Watson</p>	<p>In accordance with Council direction from early 2025, the location options in southwest Nobleton have been considered to address the Community Area and Employment Area land needs for Nobleton.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>report, specifically "Option 2."</p> <p>Key points from the comments include:</p> <p>1. Residential Expansion Lands ("Option 2"):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are within the built boundary of Nobleton and present a unique opportunity for responsible development. - The previous inclusion within the built boundary and existing road stubs indicate foresight for residential development. - The commenter requests clarification on the term "potential" regarding future employment lands, urging a thorough analysis to determine if conflicts exist or if integrated land use is possible. - A comprehensive impact assessment is proposed to address conflicts and explore mitigation strategies, aiming for harmonious coexistence of residential and employment uses. - The property's strategic location within the built boundary minimizes urban sprawl and aligns with smart growth and provincial planning priorities. - The developer, Fandor Homes, commits to building vibrant, sustainable communities that complement Nobleton's character and provide community benefits and amenities. <p>2. Employment/Commercial Lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A second parcel west of the residential lands is proposed for employment land expansion, also labeled "Option 2" in the Watson report. - This parcel offers transitional opportunities to 	<p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton, as shown in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>integrate employment development with the community, including a natural buffer area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It serves as a gateway property into Nobleton from the west, with potential for welcoming and attractive architecture to positively impact the community and economy. - The land ownership has deep roots in Nobleton, with a commitment to legacy and community benefit over maximizing financial yield. - The commenter urges the council to include these lands in the Option 2 boundaries and conduct a comprehensive impact assessment to minimize conflicts and respect Nobleton's long-term vision. <p>3. Overall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The exclusion of these lands based on "potential" and undefined future employment lands is considered premature. - The commenter expresses willingness to collaborate with the Township to find balanced, responsible solutions that support both residential and employment growth while respecting community values. <p>The document also includes maps from the Watson report showing the location options for residential and employment growth in Nobleton, highlighting the areas discussed in the comments.</p>	
41.	Domenic Macera	24-Feb-25	Letter	The comment from Domenic Macera expresses strong disagreement with the proposal to designate employment land around Diana Drive	Thank you for your submission regarding the neighbourhood at Diana Drive and Hilda Road.

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				and Hilda. He emphasizes that the area has been "estate residential" for 35 years and should not include factories or industries. He argues that it is illogical to introduce industrial activities in a residential estate when there are already designated employment lands available for expansion. He describes the proposal as "insane" to implement in a residential area.	The Township has developed a Concept Plan for Southwest Nobleton, included in Discussion Paper 5, which designates lands around Diana Drive and Hilda Road for Residential and Deferred Residential uses, intended for development within and beyond the 2051 planning horizon. The Employment Area uses that were proposed in closer proximity to Diana Drive and Hilda Road have been reoriented in the Concept Plan to have frontages along 10 th Concession, thereby providing a larger setback from the existing residential uses in your neighbourhood. Council's upcoming consideration of this Concept Plan will guide future secondary planning, and the Project Team encourages continued engagement as policies and Official Plan Amendments are developed.
42.	Cleve Mortelliti	24-Feb-25	Email	The comment in the document requests that the council defer the decision on intensification targets for three villages until further analysis is completed. The commenter believes the current targets are too high and will worsen servicing and parking issues, especially in non-transit supported villages in King City. They argue that higher intensification targets will not lead to faster or more affordable home building, which is contrary to the intended goal. The commenter offers to discuss additional considerations at a later time.	Thank you for your comments regarding intensification targets in King Township's villages. Council provided direction on intensification as part of the Official Plan Review on February 24, 2025, and subsequently offered additional direction on growth management considerations in June 2025. These directions have informed the policy framework and proposed directions outlined in the 13 Discussion Papers. The intensification targets reflect strategic planning objectives and are intended to guide long-term growth while balancing infrastructure capacity, land use compatibility, and community character.
43.	C. Di Rezze AME-TECH Developments Limited	23-Feb-25	Letter	The comments provided in the document can be summarized as follows: 1. The client, 811880 Ontario Inc., has retained AME-TECH Developments Limited to provide information to the Township of King regarding the existing and proposed future use of their property located at 270 Main Street, King City, Ontario (Part of Lot 19, Registered Plan 87).	Thank you for your submission dated February 23, 2025, regarding the property at 270 Main Street, King City (Part of Lot 19, Registered Plan 87). Under the Village Natural Heritage System policies outlined in Section 5.15.3 of the <i>Our King Official Plan</i> , permitted uses may include those from adjacent land use designations without requiring an amendment to the Plan, provided that refinements to the delineation of the Natural Heritage System are supported by a Natural Heritage Evaluation or

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>2. The client has owned the lands for over 30 years and is aware of the City's Official Plan review process. They wish to formally record their intentions for future redevelopment.</p> <p>3. According to the City's Official Plan Schedule 'D3', the subject lands are categorized within the Village Core and Special Policy Area, but the client notes that the plan incorrectly identifies some portions of the land as Village Natural Heritage System. They acknowledge that part of the land is natural/protected wetland, but the rest is viable for future development.</p> <p>4. In January 2006, a Development Concept Plan was prepared by the client's architect and neighboring business owners. This plan identified existing buildings, residential/commercial uses, and a detached garage on the site. It proposed a future 4-storey residential building with 30 units, internal laneways for better servicing of local businesses, traffic circulation, and additional parking.</p> <p>5. The proposed uses are outside the Regional Flood Line except for some parking areas, which can be flood protected.</p> <p>6. In April 2022, the client applied for and was granted a "site clean-up" permit by the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) to remove fallen dead wood and trim overgrown weeds and brush within the wetland limits.</p>	<p>Hydrological Evaluation conducted in accordance with Section 4.3 of the Plan.</p> <p>Through a landowner-initiated, site-specific application, a Natural Heritage Evaluation may be submitted, and the Township may refine the extent of the designation based on the findings of that evaluation.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>7. The client is committed to enhancing the area while protecting natural features and providing the community with additional rental housing units and parking.</p> <p>8. Attached for reference are the January 2006 Concept Plan and the Site Clean-Up Plan approved by LSRCA in April 2022.</p> <p>Overall, the comments emphasize the client's long-term ownership, intention to develop viable portions of the land responsibly, and compliance with environmental regulations while addressing community needs for housing and parking.</p>	
44.	Nobleton Optometry	Monday, February 17, 2025	Email	<p>The comments in the document are from Dr. Melisa Siragusa, owner of Nobleton Optometry. She expresses support for the proposed parking lot expansion for the Nobleton medical building. Dr. Siragusa highlights that parking is currently extremely limited for their patients, which is a significant challenge. She advocates for the building's parking lot to be contiguous with the Nobleton Arena's parking lot to better meet the growing needs of their approximately 10,000 patients and ensure safe access. Additionally, she suggests the installation of a traffic light at the intersection of Highway 27 and Parkview/Ellis Avenue to improve safety and ease congestion, especially for southbound exits during northbound traffic congestion. Overall, she requests consideration of these concerns to support continued expansion and better service for patients and staff.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence concerning available and safe access to parking for the Nobleton medical building located at 12931 Highway 27, Unit 2.</p> <p>These comments will be considered as the Township continues to evolve the Neighbourhood Concept Plan in Nobleton. Opportunities for further consideration of block design considerations will be a part of the Community Planning Permit By-law following the completion of the Official Plan Review. Please continue to monitor Township initiatives.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
45.	Skelton, Brumwell & Associates Inc.	24-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The document is a formal submission by Skelton Brumwell & Associates Inc. on behalf of Schomberg Holdings Inc., requesting the inclusion of the property at 6250 Lloydtown-Aurora Road, Schomberg, into the Township of King's growth area plans as part of the 'Our King' Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Summary of key comments and points:</p> <p>1. Property Location and Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is located immediately south of Schomberg's existing urban boundary with 175 meters frontage on Lloydtown-Aurora Road. - The total site size is approximately 100,628 m², with about 84,000 m² developable after excluding the Natural Heritage area. - Current land use designations classify the site as agricultural and part of the Greenbelt/Protected Countryside. - Proposed designation is primarily residential with potential for employment lands. <p>2. Planning Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Growth Management Strategy (GMS) underestimates housing needs in Schomberg, projecting only 300 new households by 2051, which does not reflect changing housing preferences and workforce mobility. - Employment Lands Strategy forecasts a deficit of employment lands and 680 new jobs by 2051, supporting the need for nearby housing to reduce commuting. - The submission highlights the importance of 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding the request for inclusion of the property at 6250 Lloydtown Aurora Road, Schomberg, within the Township of King's growth area plans as part of the ongoing Official Plan (OP) Review.</p> <p>The Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Report and its Addendum, outline that Schomberg has sufficient greenfield lands to accommodate its forecasted population and housing growth to the 2051 planning horizon. The analysis confirms that Schomberg's Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) is expected to be fully built out by 2051, with no additional land required to meet residential demand.</p> <p>The Township's housing supply data indicates that Schomberg has approximately 80 units of greenfield housing potential, which aligns with its modest growth forecast of 320 new households over the period. Further, under the policies of the PPS the Township is not able to plan for Community Area growth beyond the 30-year horizon. Therefore, Schomberg is not forecast to have a deficit in greenfield land supply and no urban expansion is required for residential purposes.</p> <p>In addition, 6250 Lloydtown Aurora Road is located outside of the settlement area boundary for Schomberg. In accordance with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan, a settlement area boundary expansion for Schomberg into the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt would not be permitted to exceed 10-ha in size, of which only 5-ha would be permitted to be used for residential purposes. Given the lot configuration and size of the property, a future settlement area boundary expansion for residential purposes on this property may be difficult to support.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the Official Plan Review.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>reducing vehicle dependency, addressing housing affordability, and supporting local workforce retention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2024 Provincial Policy Statement promotes mixed-use, complete communities with efficient land use and reduced long commutes. - The York Region Official Plan supports better connectivity between employment and residential areas. <p>3. Technical Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road access can be extended from Moore Park Drive cul-de-sac, and the site has direct frontage on Loydtown-Aurora Road, connecting to major highways. - Water and wastewater servicing capacity is confirmed by the York Region 2022 Master Plan, with proximity to the Schomberg Water Resource Recovery Facility. - Environmental considerations include the site's adjacency to the Greenbelt but outside the Natural Heritage System, with any development subject to an Environmental Impact Study. - The site is adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods, allowing seamless land-use integration. <p>4. Supporting Studies (if required):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Impact Study to assess Greenbelt implications. - Transportation Study for road network integration. - Market Demand Study for workforce housing 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>needs.</p> <p>5. Conclusion and Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission argues that including 6250 Lloydtown-Aurora Road in growth plans is a logical, sustainable, and forward-thinking decision aligned with municipal, regional, and provincial priorities. - The site offers cost-effective, low-impact development potential that supports vitality, sustainability, and a balanced community with residential and employment growth. - A formal request is made for the Township to consider this site for inclusion in the revised Official Plan for residential and/or employment use. <p>6. Additional Visual Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are adjacent to a fully serviced subdivision and have road access potential. - The lands are not within the Natural Heritage System and do not comprise a viable agricultural parcel. - The opportunity exists to provide affordable housing (targeting 25% affordable units), increase housing density with townhomes and apartments, and incorporate retail elements to serve the community. <p>Overall, the comments advocate for the strategic inclusion of this property in the Township's growth area to address housing, employment, sustainability, and infrastructure needs in Schomberg.</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
46.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	21-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Paul Brown & Associates Inc. on behalf of Fandor King-10 Holdings Inc. regarding the lands at 6675 King Road in Nobleton, Township of King, focus on the following key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands, approximately 16.95 hectares (41.9 acres), are currently agricultural with no structures and are located at the southeast corner of King Road and Concession Road 10. 2. The lands are designated as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area" in the Township's Official Plan titled "Our King." 3. Paul Brown & Associates attended a public open house and reviewed the Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy report, which recommends expanding the Nobleton Urban Area boundary by about 8 hectares for residential use and 21 hectares for employment use. 4. The report presents two options for establishing a new Employment Area in Nobleton. Although the subject lands are not included in these options, the consultants support further analysis of Option 2, which involves a larger expansion. 5. They highlight that Nobleton currently lacks significant employment lands within its urban boundary, and expanding the boundary to 	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>include additional employment lands would help create a more complete community and meet long-term employment land demand.</p> <p>6. The subject lands, while not a large contiguous area for employment development, could provide transitional employment opportunities such as industrial condominiums or office space compatible with nearby residential areas.</p> <p>7. The recommendation is for Council to direct staff to include the subject lands in the continued analysis of Option 2 for the future employment area in Nobleton during the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>8. The consultants express willingness to continue discussions and monitor the Official Plan Review process on behalf of the owner.</p> <p>In summary, the comments advocate for considering the subject lands as part of an expanded employment area in Nobleton to support balanced community growth and employment opportunities.</p>	
47.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	21-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Paul Brown & Associates Inc. (PBA) on behalf of Fandor King-10 Holdings Inc. regarding the lands at 6375 King Road, Nobleton, focus on the Township of King's Official Plan Review and Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy. Key points include:</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>1. The subject lands (approximately 25 acres) are currently designated as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area," where growth is not planned until after 2031, despite being within the built boundary but outside the Nobleton Urban Area.</p> <p>2. PBA notes that these lands should have been included within the urban boundary in previous Official Plan reviews, as they are among the few parcels designated as Village Reserve Area inside the Built Boundary.</p> <p>3. PBA attended a public open house and reviewed the Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy, which presents three options for modest expansion of the Nobleton Urban Area, including the subject lands.</p> <p>4. The subject lands are identified as the least favorable option due to potential land-use compatibility conflicts with the Nobleton Employment Area.</p> <p>5. PBA requests that Council direct staff to analyze all three options for the Nobleton Community Area, rather than only Options 1 and 3 as recommended by staff, to ensure a comprehensive review.</p> <p>6. They caution against prematurely dismissing the subject lands for future residential or urban use, as this could limit development potential and create a void within the urban area, leaving</p>	<p>and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>the lands restricted to agricultural uses that may be less compatible with existing residents.</p> <p>7. PBA welcomes continued dialogue with Township staff to explore design and policy measures to mitigate potential land use conflicts and protect both existing and future residents.</p> <p>8. The letter respectfully requests that Council amend report recommendation No. 17 to include all three options in the ongoing Official Plan Review process and expresses willingness to continue monitoring and participating in discussions.</p> <p>Overall, the comments advocate for a thorough and inclusive analysis of all growth options involving the subject lands to support balanced development and community interests in Nobleton.</p>	
48.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	21-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. in their submission to the Township of King regarding the "Our King" Official Plan Review focus on the following key points:</p> <p>1. Introduction and Subject Property: - Thorstone Consulting was retained by Trisan Construction to provide planning advice related to the Township's Growth Management Study and Official Plan Review. - The subject property is Phase II of the Forestbrook Hills subdivision in Schomberg, previously controlled by two ownerships, now</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding Phase II of the Forestbrook Hills subdivision in Schomberg, specifically the Church Street frontage as a potential intensification area for medium density residential development. We appreciate your interest and contribution to the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township supports intensification as a key strategy to accommodate growth efficiently, diversify housing options, and optimize infrastructure use in alignment with Provincial and Regional planning policies. To the 2051 planning horizon, across the Township, over 50% of new housing is forecast to be in the form of intensification.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>acquired by Trisan Construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft approved Plan of Subdivision includes 51 single detached residential lots and provisions for the Rosalina Drive extension with breakaway bollards for emergency access. <p>2. Review Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They reviewed applicable policies from the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2024, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, York Region Official Plan, and Township of King Official Plan and Zoning By-law. - They also reviewed the Township's Strategic Plan, Economic Development Strategy, and the "Living in King" discussion paper. <p>3. Provincial Policy - 2024 PPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PPS emphasizes intensification and encourages municipalities to provide a range and mix of housing options to meet residents' needs, including affordable housing. - Planning for infrastructure and employment areas may extend beyond a 20-30 year horizon. <p>4. Township of King Official Plan "Our King":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft subdivision plan was approved under previous policies (OPA #47) permitting only low-density housing. - The current Official Plan (adopted 2019) allows a range of low and medium density residential uses, including singles, semis, towns, and low-rise apartments. - The subdivision owner is exploring options to redesign lands fronting Church Street for higher 	<p>However, the Church Street frontage for the subdivision is considered greenfield area by the Township as it is outside of the built-up area. Further, the Medium Density Residential designation in the Official Plan provides for the continuation of existing medium density residential sites. As this is not an existing medium residential site, and is not within an intensification area, it would be more appropriate for this request to be considered through a site-specific amendment to Our King. A site-specific application would also allow for a more detailed review of your proposal in the context of its unique location, land use, and planning considerations, and could be considered concurrently with any necessary changes to the draft plan approval.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>density apartment housing to address community needs for attainable rental housing.</p> <p>5. "Living in King" Discussion Paper #2 (January 2025):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The paper supports a higher focus on a range and mix of housing types and intensification targets (52%). - It encourages redevelopment of underutilized sites to increase housing choice and supply. - The lands fronting Church Street are identified as an ideal opportunity for higher density housing to contribute to affordable and attainable housing supply. <p>6. Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Church Street frontage in Forestbrook Hills Phase II should be identified as a key intensification site. - It should be designated as Medium Density Residential in the new Official Plan. <p>7. Closing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thorstone Consulting expresses willingness to meet with Township staff to discuss the submission in greater detail and provide further input into the Growth Management and Official Plan Review process. <p>In summary, the comments advocate for recognizing the Church Street frontage of the Forestbrook Hills Phase II subdivision as a key site for medium density residential intensification</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				to support affordable and attainable housing goals in line with provincial and regional policies.	
49.	Nancy Hopkinson	13-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments from Nancy Hopkinson express strong objection to expanding development into the Greenbelt area outside the defined urban boundaries of towns or hamlets. She emphasizes the importance of the Greenbelt in protecting air and water quality, reducing flood risks, providing wildlife habitat, and maintaining green space. She specifically opposes two proposed settlement area expansions: one in the southeast quadrant of King Rd. and Hwy 400 for commercial uses, and another on the south side of Hwy 9 for employment uses. Additionally, she raises concerns about the feasibility of supporting a large population in Nobleton due to limitations on sewage and water infrastructure, suggesting the Official Plan should include cautionary notes about local servicing capabilities. Overall, she objects to any Greenbelt expansions and urges the council to protect the Greenbelt.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The Phase 2 Growth Management Strategy and Employment Lands Strategy Report dated Feb 10, 2025, prepared by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. for King Township identifies that King City is forecast to experience a shortfall of commercial land by 2051 and Schomberg is forecast to require an additional 10 hectares of Employment Area land. While intensification of existing commercial and employment areas plays a role in accommodating future growth, it alone is insufficient to meet the projected demand. As a result, the Strategy recommends exploring a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) for King City to accommodate additional commercial land needs and for Schomberg to accommodate additional employment land needs.</p> <p>The Township is in the process of undertaking a Natural Heritage Study to determine if natural heritage features are present on the lands, and to assess their suitability in accommodating employment uses. The results of the Natural Heritage Study will be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>The Servicing Our Communities Discussion Paper, as released as part of the Official Plan Review emphasizes the importance of aligning infrastructure planning with population and employment forecasts and proposes strengthening policies that require servicing capacity assessments as part of development approvals.</p> <p>On the matter of servicing in Nobleton, the Township is updating its Water and Wastewater Master Plan in collaboration with York Region to address the Village's long-term servicing needs.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
50.	Radu Selea	21-Feb-25	Email	<p>The comments provided by Radu Selea regarding the 2051 Official Plan Review express strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of areas designated in Option 1 and Option 2 into employment zones. Radu Selea highlights that the Diana/Hilda community has been overlooked for a long time, and allowing industrial land use in these areas would lead to the complete erosion of the neighborhood. Despite paying high estate property taxes, the community experiences inadequate municipal services such as poor maintenance, snow removal, and general upkeep, which are better in other areas of Nobleton. Rezoning would worsen these issues and negatively impact residents of Diana and Hilda Drive. Radu urges reconsideration of the plan to protect the community.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding the neighbourhood at Diana Drive and Hilda Road.</p> <p>The location options that were identified in the February 2025 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified two options for potential Employment Areas, both in the southern portion of Nobleton to align with future transportation networks, including King Vaughan Road and the future 413. Locating Employment Area lands further north in Nobleton would require truck traffic to infiltrate through the Village, causing increased truck traffic in the Village Cores and existing neighbourhoods. This would present both land use compatibility concerns, traffic and transportation issues and has the potential for noise, vibration, odour and safety concerns. Nobleton also does not currently have any Employment Area lands, so identifying new Employment Areas for Nobleton is an important component of this Official Plan Review.</p> <p>In order to provide clarity and increased certainty in future land use both within and beyond the 2051 planning horizon the Township has prepared a Concept Plan for Southwest Nobleton that is included in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve. This Concept Plan builds off the Location Options that were presented to Council through the Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy, and set out proposed future land uses for all lands within southwest Nobleton.</p> <p>The lands surrounding Diana Drive and Hilda Road are proposed to be designated for Residential and Deferred Residential purposes. Residential lands are forecast to be built out over the 2051 planning horizon, with Deferred Residential lands being contemplated for residential uses at a future date, beyond the 2051 horizon.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025 Report to Council seeks Council's endorsement of the Concept Plan, and direction to develop policies for a Site-Specific Policy Area for south-west Nobleton that aligns with the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>Concept Plan. This will provide a framework for a future secondary plan for southwest Nobleton in order to undertake the necessary land use and infrastructure planning to enable growth in this quadrant.</p> <p>Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>
51.	Angela Rose	2/13/2025	Email	<p>These comments suggest forward-thinking planning for future transportation needs in the community, specifically focusing on the advent of self-driving cars within the next 30 years. The comments envision fleets of self-driving cars parked in nearby multi-story lots, ready to be summoned for use, which would reduce the need for personal car ownership. Highlights from the comments include recognizing several advantages of this shift, including less traffic and pollution, elimination of the need for garages, car insurance, and fuel costs, reduced road construction, and safer traffic flow with fewer accidents.</p> <p>The comments emphasize the need to start planning now by reserving space for parking lots and adapting roads to accommodate self-driving technology. The commenter believes this future is realistic and not too far off.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding future transportation needs in King Township. The Official Plan Update supports fostering a multi-modal transportation network that prioritizes active transportation, transit-oriented development, and innovative solutions aligned with sustainability and community well-being.</p> <p>Emerging practices suggest autonomous vehicles operating as a flexible fleet would reduce parking demand. This would free parking spaces for uses such as real estate development, public spaces, and green spaces or infrastructure. Proposed policy directions in the OP Update align with current provincial policies which eliminated parking requirements parking in transit areas, and supports transportation demand management, complete streets design, and active transportation. Continuing with these policy directives aligns with a future that includes autonomous vehicles.</p> <p>As outlined in our Official Plan update to 2051, King Township is committed to fostering a multi-modal transportation network that prioritizes active transportation, transit-oriented development, and innovative solutions aligned with sustainability and community well-being. Your suggestion to proactively plan for autonomous vehicle fleets and associated infrastructure, such as dedicated parking facilities and road adaptations, aligns with our vision to integrate</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>emerging technologies responsibly while preserving the rural character and quality of life in our Villages and Hamlets.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of anticipating technological advancements and their implications for land use, transportation planning, and environmental stewardship. As such, your input will be valuable in informing ongoing discussions and future reviews of our transportation policies and infrastructure strategies. We encourage continued community engagement on these topics to ensure that King Township remains adaptive and resilient in meeting the evolving needs of our residents.</p> <p>Thank you again for contributing to the dialogue on shaping a sustainable and innovative future for our community.</p>
52.	Ken Ono	2/11/2025	Email	<p>The comment from Ken Ono suggests that a key objective should be added to emphasize the importance of walkability within and between communities. The comments emphasize this will contribute to making King a more livable and healthier environment as it grows.</p>	<p>Thank you for your emailed comments.</p> <p>The <u>Complete Communities Discussion Paper</u> highlights walkability as a key element of creating livable and inclusive neighbourhoods, and several preliminary policy directions that emphasize the importance of walkability as a foundational element of healthy, inclusive, and connected communities.</p> <p>The paper recommends strengthening policies that support active transportation, including walking and cycling, by integrating trail planning with growth and intensification strategies. It proposes the development of Trails Design Standards, improvements to trail maintenance and accessibility, and partnerships to expand the trail network. These directions aim to ensure that trails and pedestrian routes are safe, inclusive, and well-connected to key destinations such as parks, schools, and community facilities.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p> <p>Thank you again for your comments.</p>
53.	Dentons Canada LLP	10-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The document is a letter dated February 10, 2025, from Dentons Canada LLP, representing Lucyna and Przemyslaw Przybylski, owners of lands at 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane, King City, in the Township of King. The letter provides comments on the King Township Official Plan Review ("King OP") and requests modifications to allow severance of the lands in conformity with the Provincial Planning Statement 2024 ("PPS 2024").</p> <p>Key points summarized:</p> <p>1. Client's Lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands contain two separate detached dwellings with individual municipal addresses, driveways, and private servicing. - The client wishes to sever the lands into two legal parcels, each with one dwelling, reflecting the existing situation. - No new development or site alteration is proposed; the severance is technical. <p>2. Land Designation and Zoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are designated Rural Area and Oak Ridges Moraine Natural Core Area. - Zoned RU1 (Rural General) and ORMFP 	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the lands municipally known as 255 Lloyds Lane. These lands are located north of the Hamlet of Pottageville, and are within the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan areas.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.2.1 of Discussion Paper 9: King's Countryside, the Official Plan Review is exploring the appropriateness of revising lot creation policies for Rural lands in the Greenbelt Plan Area. In accordance with policy 3.1.4.5 of the Greenbelt Plan, municipal Official Plans are permitted to be more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan with respect to severances on Rural lands. The Greenbelt Plan currently permits the creation of a single lot for residential development on Rural lands within the Greenbelt Plan area, provided they comply with the minimum distance separation formulae, do not impact or fragment key natural heritage or key hydrologic features, and do not extend or promote strip development. Under the current policy framework an Official Plan Amendment application would be required to facilitate this form of lot creation, provided the proposal conforms with this policy of the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>Staff note that should King's Official Plan be amended to permit this form of rural lot creation, while the portion of the property on Lloyds Lane that is within the Greenbelt Plan area is designated Rural and Protected Countryside, it is also within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan. A comprehensive natural heritage review would be required to ensure that the proposed lot creation would not result in the fragmentation of natural heritage or hydrologic features.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>(Oak Ridges Moraine Feature Protection) with additional Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine protections.</p> <p>3. Policy Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPS 2024 permits severance of rural lands where site conditions support appropriate sewage and water services. - The Greenbelt Plan 2017 allows minor lot creation or adjustments in specific circumstances, including technical severances that do not create new residential lots or development. - The current King OP restricts lot creation except in limited cases, generally discouraging new lots in Rural Areas. <p>4. Request for Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The letter requests that King OP be amended to permit severance reflecting the existing two dwellings on separate parcels without new development or site alteration. - Proposed language would allow minor lot adjustments or boundary additions that do not create new residential lots or increase fragmentation of natural features. - Alternatively, a site-specific policy could be adopted to recognize the existing two dwellings as separate conveyable parcels. <p>5. Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The severance aligns with PPS 2024 and Greenbelt Plan policies. - The existing dwellings have private servicing 	<p>Thank you for your comments and we encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>suitable for separate lots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No physical or character impact on the neighborhood or surrounding area is expected. - The amendment would legally recognize the existing situation. <p>6. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The letter expresses willingness to discuss the proposed revisions with Township staff and invites contact for questions. <p>Overall, the comments advocate for a policy amendment or site-specific policy in the King OP to permit a technical severance of the lands at 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane into two separate parcels, each containing one existing dwelling, consistent with provincial policies and without new development.</p>	
54.	J Luciani	07-Feb-25	January 2025 Open House Worksheet	<p>The comments provided in the document reflect community feedback on key policy directions for the "Our King 2051 Official Plan Review" in the areas of Living in King, Working in King, and Moving and Connecting in King. The summary of comments is as follows:</p> <p>Living in King:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong opposition to apartments and high-rise buildings; preference for low-rise, low-density housing to protect community character. - New housing should be located along Highway 27 where there is existing transport infrastructure, avoiding traffic through neighborhoods. - Support for more density and townhouses in 	<p>Thank you for your comments about intensification in King City. As outlined in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, the Province requires municipalities to support intensification to meet housing and infrastructure goals, including gentle density in existing neighbourhoods. Township Council also endorsed an intensification target of 51% for the Township in June 2025.</p> <p>In existing and established neighbourhoods, intensification and gentle density will primarily take the form of additional residential units, with the potential to consider semi-detached dwellings or duplexes on corner lots, where they can integrate sensitively into the neighbourhood while preserving their character.</p> <p>The majority of higher-density development is directed to the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas where infrastructure and services can support more compact growth. The current Official Plan, Our King,</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>new projects but no apartments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maximum building heights suggested are 2-3 storeys generally, with up to 4 storeys only near the GO Station. - Complete communities should have 2-3 storey shop houses. <p>Working in King:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preference for Option 1 for new growth on Highway 27 for employment uses. - Some preference expressed for Nobleton for employment expansion. - Support for 2-storey shophouses for commercial development. - Expansion of population-related employment uses in village centers is acceptable. - Support for appropriate transitions between employment and sensitive land uses. - Opposition to apartments in commercial redevelopment. <p>Moving and Connecting in King:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for growth along Highway 27. - No comments provided on innovation through cost-effective and sustainable infrastructure. <p>Overall, the community feedback emphasizes maintaining a low-rise, low-density character with careful location of new housing and employment growth along major corridors like Highway 27, limiting building heights mostly to 2-3 storeys except near transit stations, and avoiding apartments in favor of townhouses and shophouses. There is also support for effective</p>	<p>which was adopted by Council in 2019 permits apartments and condominiums of up to six (6) storeys in certain designations, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>In terms of Employment, Council has provided direction to pursue Location Option 2 for Nobleton. A comprehensive Concept Plan has been prepared for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton and is presented in Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve.</p> <p>Your feedback is valuable in ensuring that intensification is implemented thoughtfully. We encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				transportation and commercial development that fits the community scale.	
55.	J Luciani	07-Feb-25	Email	<p>The comments in the document express strong opposition to the plan for King City to have 3,500 new apartment units by 2051. The sender is concerned that these apartments, described as small investor condos around 500 square feet, do not fit the low-rise, rural character of King City and Nobleton. They prefer single detached, semi-detached homes, and townhouses to maintain community style and affordability for families. The sender criticizes the impact on traffic and transit, noting limited transit options and increased congestion. They also emphasize that King should control its own planning rather than York Region, advocating for fewer apartments and more attractive neighborhoods with trees and sidewalks. The sender suggests new subdivisions should be located along Highway 27, where infrastructure is better established, rather than behind existing residential areas. Finally, they urge councilors to oppose the apartment development agenda, stating it is not wanted by the community.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about intensification in King City. As outlined in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, the Province requires municipalities to support intensification to meet housing and infrastructure goals, including gentle density in existing neighbourhoods. Township Council also endorsed an intensification target of 51% for the Township in June 2025.</p> <p>In existing and established neighbourhoods, intensification and gentle density will primarily take the form of additional residential units, with the potential to consider semi-detached dwellings or duplexes on corner lots, where they can integrate sensitively into the neighbourhood while preserving their character.</p> <p>The majority of higher-density development is directed to the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas where infrastructure and services can support more compact growth.</p> <p>Your feedback is valuable in ensuring that intensification is implemented thoughtfully. We encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>
56.	Anna Santarossa	2/10/2025	Email	<p>The comments provided in the document express concerns and questions about the Official Town Plan for Laskay. The main points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about the introduction of substantial economic activity in a small region, which could create opportunities but also challenges related to land use balance, infrastructure, heritage conservation, and environmental sustainability. 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the Official Plan Review and policy directions related to the Hamlet of Laskay.</p> <p>Laskay is in a unique location of the Township due to its location between the two largest Village's in King (King City and Nobleton), its proximity to Highway 400, and its proximity to the Township's Whitebelt lands, which are lands outside of the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- Questions about whether all purple areas on the map are under consideration for development and if residents' preferences for development areas are being taken into account for Laskay.</p> <p>- A feeling that there is a disproportionately large amount of economic and commercial land use proposed for Laskay compared to the size of King Township.</p> <p>- Specific questions raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How to preserve the heritage aspect of the hamlet and whether it could be designated as a heritage conservation district. 2. Concerns about increased traffic due to higher employment activity, affecting air quality and noise levels, and whether there are mitigation plans. 3. Whether there is a proposal to widen Weston Road and how to maintain the hamlet's character given the proximity of homes to the road. 4. Inquiry about environmental assessments for a significant space indicated for economic development that includes existing green space. 5. Concerns about commercial space near Highway 400 increasing traffic and surrounding the hamlet with economic and commercial development. <p>- Requests to present the proposal to Laskay residents and to share presentation slides via email or online access.</p> <p>- An overall hope to balance development and change with mitigation of negative impacts on the small hamlet.</p>	<p>The locations identified in purple in the Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy in February 2025 represented locations being considered for future employment development in the Township. In proximity to Laskay, lands within the Whitebelt were shown as having long-term potential for an Employment Area, and lands on the east side of Highway 400, south of King Road were shown as a potential commercial area. In addition, lands municipally known as 25 Laskay Mills Drive were identified as a potential Hamlet Employment Area.</p> <p>The Project Team is actively seeking feedback on these location options, and has held a number of public engagement sessions since the beginning of 2025 to obtain community feedback on the location options. The Discussion Papers released in September 2025 provide an overview of the proposed policy directions for these areas, and will inform the future amendments to Our King to guide growth and new opportunities over the 2051 planning horizon.</p> <p>In terms of your specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As outlined in Discussion Paper 10: King's Hamlets, new policies are proposed to be introduced to Our King to recognize the heritage context of King's Hamlets and provide increased cultural heritage support. 2. The Township's Transportation Master Plan is underway, and is examining the potential impacts from an increased population on the Township's road network. 3. Weston Road is a Regional Arterial Road. Any future updates to the road will be directed by York Region. 4. All development applications are required to undertake a number of studies, including environmental studies. Should these areas be redesignated in the Official Plan for future employment/residential/commercial development, a number of site-specific studies would need to be conducted and development approvals obtained before construction could

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>The commenter, Anna Santarossa, expresses excitement about Laskay's future but emphasizes the need to address these concerns thoughtfully.</p>	<p>occur. The Project Team notes that development of this nature would not be permitted within the natural heritage system.</p> <p>5. Should Council provide direction to explore this site as a future commercial area for King City additional supporting studies, including a traffic and transportation study, would be required.</p> <p>All project materials are available on the SpeaKING Project Page, including presentation slides from the January 2025 Open Houses, and the presentation boards from the September 2025 Open Houses.</p>
57.	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	03-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments from Humphries Planning Group Inc. on behalf of Crisdan Holdings Inc. regarding the 2051 King Township Official Plan Review for the property at 13500 Highway 27 include the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They have reviewed the January 2025 Discussion Papers related to the site. - They agree that the Township should reconsider the maximum gross density of 7-12 units per hectare. - They note that the current provision requiring single-family housing lots to have at least 12.2 meters frontage does not align with housing policies in the Provincial Planning Statement. - They request that the Township consider increased density permissions that allow for single-family homes on smaller lot frontages, as well as townhouses and multiples, as additional building typologies for the Crisdan Holdings property. - They ask to be kept informed about the next steps in the Official Plan Review process. <p>The letter is signed by Rosemarie L. Humphries,</p>	<p>Thank you for your submitted comments regarding 13500 Highway 27.</p> <p>Density policies for all residential land uses are explored in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification. The Neighbourhood designation is identified as 35 people and jobs per ha, in accordance with Council direction from June 2025. This density translates to approximately 10-20 units per hectare, depending on the amount of commercial and non-residential development proposed within the site. This shift in density from 7-12 units per hectare is proposed through the policy directions to allow for more variation in unit and lot size within new neighbourhoods, while also supporting opportunities for new commercial and non-residential uses within neighbourhoods to promote walkability and the creation of complete communities.</p> <p>We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				President of Humphries Planning Group Inc., and copies were sent to relevant Township officials and Crisdan Holdings representatives.	
58.	Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc.	19-Nov-24	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Thorstone Consulting Services, Inc. on behalf of Trisan Construction regarding the Phase I Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy for the Schomberg Employment Area Expansion in the Township of King can be summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. **Subject Property and Review Activities**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject property is approximately 40 hectares at the southwest corner of 8th Concession Road and Highway 9, currently tenant farmed with no significant natural heritage features. - The property includes a channelized tributary of the Holland River. - Thorstone Consulting reviewed relevant provincial policies, the Township of King Official Plan and Zoning By-law, conducted site inspections, and reviewed surrounding land use patterns. <p>2. **Provincial Policy Context**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2024 Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) replaces the 2020 PPS and allows planning authorities to plan for employment lands beyond a 25-year horizon, up to 30 years. - The subject lands are within the Protected Countryside of the Provincial Greenbelt Plan, but the Greenbelt boundaries may need reconsideration to accommodate long-term 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Should there be a change in Provincial direction, or changes to the boundaries of the Greenbelt Plan the Township would update its Plans and policies accordingly.</p> <p>Staff have investigated through the Phase 2 Report from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. opportunities for Employment Areas in proximity to Highway 400, Highway 9, and the future 413. These location options are presented in Chapters 6 and 7 of the Phase 2 Report. The Phase 2 Report was released Feb 24, 2025.</p> <p>Staff agree that local employment, through all categories of employment including Employment Area employment and Population-Related employment, contribute to the creation of complete communities.</p> <p>A 10-ha portion of these lands has been identified in the Phase 2 Report as a potential option to address Schomberg's Employment Area land needs shortage. Staff note that there may be challenges associated with this location option, particularly related to the extent of the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt. A Natural Heritage Background Study is currently underway for these lands to assess their feasibility and the appropriateness of considering them for a settlement area boundary expansion. This Report and policy directions associated with natural heritage considerations will be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>The Township is looking to update its Economic Development Strategy following the Official Plan Review. The opportunity to conduct a development feasibility study on Greenbelt protected lands in these locations may be assessed through that process. Staff recommend reaching out to the Township's Economic Development Division for an</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>growth to 2051 and beyond.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Region of York's Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) supports considering Greenbelt lands along strategic provincial highway corridors for employment uses. <p>3. **Local Policy Alignment**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township of King's Corporate Strategic Plan (adopted 2023) prioritizes enriching community well-being and creating employment opportunities. - The Township Official Plan "Our King" (adopted 2019) emphasizes increasing local job opportunities, diversifying the economy, and leveraging proximity to Highway 400 and the Greater Golden Horseshoe for economic development. - The King Economic Development Strategy (2018) highlights the need to attract new business investment and address the lack of suitable employment lands. <p>4. **Phase I Employment Land Strategy Findings**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Watson Associates report identifies a shortfall of employment lands in Nobleton and a need for an additional 21 hectares to meet employment growth forecasts. - No additional employment lands are identified in King City or Schomberg in the report. - Thorstone Consulting supports the identification and designation of the subject 	<p>update on the status of this Project.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>lands for future employment land development based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Their adjacency to the Schomberg Settlement Area boundary. - Direct access to Highway 9 and proximity to Highway 400. - Logical extension of existing serviced employment lands in Schomberg. - Availability of municipal sanitary sewage and water servicing. - Inclusion of these lands aligns with Region of York Council resolutions and the 2024 PPS allowing employment lands beyond 2051. - The designation supports Township goals and policies for employment growth and economic development. <p>5. **Recommendations**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the lands west of 8th Concession Road and south of Highway 9 as a “Future Urban Employment Area.” - Support Planning Staff’s recommendation to explore higher employment area targets to meet strategic goals. - Support review of urban area boundary expansions to allow for fully serviced employment lands expansion in Schomberg. <p>6. **Next Steps**:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thorstone Consulting expresses willingness to meet with Township staff to discuss the submission in detail. - They request to be kept informed and included in the Township’s Phase I Growth 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Management and Employment Land Strategy Review process.</p> <p>The attached map illustrates the subject lands in red adjacent to the Schomberg Settlement Area boundary (blue), existing designated employment lands (light blue), and proposed settlement area expansion lands (purple).</p>	
59.	MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture	12-Dec-24	Letter	<p>The document is a formal submission from MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture on behalf of the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group (NSLG) regarding the Township of King Official Plan Review and Growth Management Strategy (GMS). The key points and comments provided are summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. NSLG Background and Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NSLG represents landowners with significant undeveloped land in the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. - The group has been engaged in development discussions since 2015. - They advocate for a long-term vision for Nobleton that includes all lands within the settlement area. - They support comprehensive infrastructure and community planning to develop Nobleton as a complete community. - They emphasize planning for opportunities and challenges related to the Highway 413 interchange. <p>2. Concerns with Incremental Growth Planning:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Infrastructure considerations will continue to be assessed as the Official Plan Review progresses. The land needs assessment for Community Area and Employment Area was conducted through the Phase 2 Report prepared by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. This Report identified an 8 ha Community Area shortfall and a 39 gross ha shortfall of Employment Area for Nobleton. These shortfalls are proposed to be addressed within the Nobleton Village Reserve. Staff note that the extension of lake-based servicing in the Greenbelt is still not permitted by Provincial policy.</p> <p>Since the Phase 2 Report, an Addendum Report was presented to Council in June 2025, identifying a land needs of 30 ha for Community Area.</p> <p>The land need recommendations of the Phase 2 Report from Watson have been assessed under the PPS 2024. The Official Plan Review is also being considered under the PPS 2024, except where the 2020 PPS and Growth Plan continue to apply in the Greenbelt Plan Area, in accordance with Amendment No. 4 to the Greenbelt Plan. As noted above, the Community Area land needs have since been revised to 30 ha, based on a revised density of 35 people and jobs per ha for new greenfield development in Nobleton.</p> <p>Staff are in agreement that redesignating lands within the Nobleton Village Reserve is not a Settlement Area boundary expansion as the lands are within a designated Settlement Area. Servicing</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Township has historically planned growth incrementally, which NSLG believes is not economically viable. - Incremental servicing upgrades have been costly and only address immediate growth needs. - The York Region Official Plan (YROP) excludes certain lands in Nobleton from growth forecasts due to servicing constraints and policy limitations. <p>3. Servicing Constraints and Policy Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nobleton lacks a lake-based servicing option, limiting growth to a stand-alone water treatment system with phosphorus discharge limits. - The Greenbelt Plan and YROP policies restrict expansion of settlement boundaries and lake-based servicing. - YROP Policy 4.5.3 allows for redesignation of agricultural lands within Nobleton through a local official plan amendment if a feasible servicing solution is demonstrated. <p>4. Recommendations for Official Plan Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update Growth Management Strategy policies to align with provincial plans allowing infrastructure planning beyond a 30-year horizon. - Specifically implement Nobleton-specific Policy 4.5.3 to permit urban development within the Nobleton Reserve Area within the new Official Plan horizon. - Conduct a comprehensive land use and servicing analysis to explore all feasible 	<p>considerations are being assessed through the Official Plan Review, and through the Township’s ongoing Water & Wastewater Master Plan Review.</p> <p>Staff acknowledge the policies of the YROP and note that as the Region is now an upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities that the YROP, as it applies to King, is the King’s Official Plan in addition to Our King.</p> <p>As per the Phase 2 Report from Watson, 37% of new development in Nobleton is forecast to be in the form of intensification. Based on this rate of intensification, a 30-ha shortfall of Community Area land has been identified for Nobleton. Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, provides a comprehensive Concept Plan for how this shortfall can be addressed within the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p> <p>The Official Plan Review will look to develop policies to support a greater supply and range of housing to support residents and future residents at all ages and stages of life.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>servicing options, including lake-based servicing, to resolve servicing constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognize that growth potential in Nobleton requires an integrated servicing solution rather than incremental upgrades. - Plan growth and infrastructure together based on the current Village boundary, not an artificial urban boundary. - Address housing supply needs by enabling a range of housing types and densities, supporting intensification and infill. - Consider employment land needs carefully, noting potential surpluses and challenges in financing infrastructure for employment lands. <p>5. Supporting Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Phase 1 GMS Report and PPS 2024 support urban expansion up to a 30-year horizon but do not fully account for Nobleton's unique circumstances. - The YROP excludes certain lands from growth forecasts due to designation as DGA + Agriculture. - NSLG's engineers have demonstrated that servicing options beyond incremental upgrades are feasible. - A comprehensive approach is needed to avoid costly incremental servicing and to support long-term growth. <p>6. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth and infrastructure planning for Nobleton must be comprehensive, integrated, and consider long-term servicing solutions. 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The Township should update policies to reflect provincial and regional plans and allow for growth within the Nobleton Reserve Area.</p> <p>- A detailed servicing and land use analysis should be undertaken to inform the Official Plan Review and support sustainable growth.</p> <p>The submission requests to be kept informed of any meetings or decisions related to this initiative. An economic analysis prepared by Keleher Planning and Economic Consulting Inc. is enclosed with the submission.</p>	
60.	Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group	13-Dec-24	Letter	<p>The comments from the Nobleton Southwest Landowner Group (NSLG) regarding the Township of King Official Plan Review and Growth Management Strategy focus on the following key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for Growth: NSLG supports the goals aligned with the Township to provide additional growth in Nobleton up to 2051. 2. Urban Boundary Expansion: They acknowledge the recommendation by the Township's consultant to expand the Nobleton urban boundary to accommodate forecasted growth, including employment and community lands. 3. Housing vs Employment Land Needs: NSLG agrees with the Town's desire to grow but emphasizes a clear need for more housing supply in various forms and less need for employment lands than currently recommended. 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding the Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>The land needs assessment for Community Area and Employment Area was conducted through the Phase 2 Report prepared by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. This Report identified an 8 ha Community Area shortfall and a 39 gross ha shortfall of Employment Area for Nobleton. These shortfalls are proposed to be addressed within the Nobleton Village Reserve. Staff note that the extension of lake-based servicing in the Greenbelt is still not permitted by Provincial policy.</p> <p>Since the Phase 2 Report, an Addendum Report was presented to Council in June 2025, identifying a land needs of 30 ha for Community Area.</p> <p>The land need recommendations of the Phase 2 Report from Watson have been assessed under the PPS 2024. The Official Plan Review is also being considered under the PPS 2024, except where the 2020 PPS and Growth Plan continue to apply in the Greenbelt Plan Area, in accordance with Amendment No. 4 to the Greenbelt Plan. As noted above, the Community Area land needs have since been revised to 30</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>4. Concept Plan: NSLG has attached a Concept Plan showing preliminary land uses and road locations to guide development and integration with the existing community.</p> <p>5. Official Plan Update: They advocate for an updated Official Plan that provides a comprehensive vision for Nobleton, including a satisfactory servicing solution to allow for a holistic servicing scheme rather than incremental approaches.</p> <p>6. Landowner Commitment: NSLG members have the willingness and financial means to develop both non-residential and residential lands and want to continue contributing to Nobleton's development.</p> <p>7. Requests: Through the Official Plan review process, NSLG requests that their lands be included within the Nobleton urban area and be granted appropriate land use designations for a range of employment and residential uses as per their Concept Plan.</p> <p>8. Communication: They request to be kept informed of any meetings or Council decisions related to this initiative.</p> <p>The attached Concept Plan visually outlines the proposed land uses and road connections for the NSLG lands in the southwest quadrant of Nobleton.</p>	<p>ha, based on a revised density of 35 people and jobs per ha for new greenfield development in Nobleton. This Community Area land needs are being considered concurrently with the Employment Area land needs for Nobleton.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, provides a comprehensive Concept Plan for how this shortfall of both Employment and Community Area lands can be addressed within the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p> <p>Servicing considerations are being assessed through the Official Plan Review, and through the Township's ongoing Water & Wastewater Master Plan Review.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
61.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	06-May-24	Letter	<p>The comments in the document from Paul Brown & Associates Inc. represent the interests of Fandor King-10 Holdings Inc. regarding the lands at 6375 King Road in Nobleton, Township of King. The key points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands (approximately 10 ha) are currently outside the Township's urban boundary and designated as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area" in the 2019 draft Official Plan (OP), which excluded them from growth and urban development up to 2031. 2. MHBC Planning, retained by the client, recommended including these lands within the "inner" urban boundary due to their potential for redevelopment and intensification, aligning with Provincial Growth Plan policies. However, these recommendations were not incorporated into the final approved 2020 OP, and the lands remain outside the urban boundary. 3. The 2022 York Region Official Plan (ROP) update identifies the subject lands within the "Towns and Villages" designation and the "Built-Up Area," which supports growth and intensification consistent with Provincial policies. 4. The letter argues that the subject lands should be reconsidered and included within the Nobleton Urban Area boundary in the Township's current OP Review to conform with the Regional Official Plan and Provincial Growth Plan. 	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>5. The document notes servicing constraints (water and wastewater) previously limited the urban boundary, but recent Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) studies and infrastructure upgrades planned through 2028 will provide sufficient capacity to support growth in Nobleton up to 2051.</p> <p>6. The letter respectfully requests that the Township of King include the subject lands within the Nobleton Urban Area boundary in the ongoing Official Plan Review to support additional growth aligned with new provincial housing targets and regional policies.</p> <p>7. The authors express willingness to discuss the matter further and monitor updates to the Official Plan review process.</p> <p>In summary, the comments advocate for expanding the urban boundary to include the subject lands to enable growth and intensification consistent with updated regional and provincial planning frameworks and infrastructure improvements.</p>	
62.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	07-Oct-24	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Paul Brown & Associates Inc. (PBA) on behalf of Fandor King-10 Holdings Inc. regarding the 6375 King Road lands in Nobleton, Township of King, focus on the following key points:</p> <p>1. Background and Location: - The subject lands are approximately 10</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>hectares (25 acres), located on the south side of King Road, west of Highway 27, and east of Concession Road 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently occupied by a construction and landscaping maintenance company. - The owner also has adjacent lands on the north side of King Road (Via Moto subdivision) nearing completion of its final phase. <p>2. Official Plan Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are within the "Built Boundary" but outside the "Nobleton Urban Area" as per the current Official Plan (OP) titled "Our King." - Designated as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area," where growth is not directed until after 2031. - PBA argues the lands should be included within the urban boundary since they are within the built-up area, correcting a misalignment in the OP. <p>3. Official Plan Review and Intensification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBA attended a public open house and notes the Town's consultant recommends expanding the Nobleton Urban Area boundary by about 8 hectares. - They encourage staff to consider the subject lands for urban boundary expansion due to their size, location, and suitability for orderly development. - The current Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires a 50% intensification target within built-up areas, reflected in the York Region Official Plan (ROP). 	<p>the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The new PPS (effective October 20, 2024) repeals the Growth Plan and directs intensification targets to be based on local conditions.</p> <p>- York Region Official Plan is now a Local Official Plan for the Township of King, allowing potential amendments to intensification targets and urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>4. Orderly Development and Infrastructure: - The subject lands offer a logical extension to the existing community with direct access to municipal infrastructure (water and sewer) via Ellis Avenue and Robinson Road. - It appears these communities were planned with anticipated westward extension into the subject lands.</p> <p>5. Conclusion and Request: - PBA respectfully requests the Township of King to include the subject lands within the Nobleton Urban Area Boundary during the Official Plan Review. - This inclusion would align the urban boundary with the built-up area, support orderly development, and help achieve intensification targets. - PBA commits to monitoring the review process and is open to further discussion.</p> <p>In summary, the comments advocate for the urban boundary to be expanded to include the subject lands to enable logical, orderly development and support the Township's</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				intensification goals under the updated planning framework.	
63.	Morrie Zylberstein	9/18/2023	Email	<p>The comment in the document expresses concern about King Township's new zoning regulations, which maintain outdated restrictions from the twentieth century. The sender, highlights that their 22-acre property is limited to one residence with no possibility of subdivision, despite the land never being farmed. They question the logic of this restriction and suggest allowing at least a few additional lots for family members to build homes. The comment emphasizes the need for more housing in Canada and Ontario and urges King Township to contribute to addressing the housing shortage.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The Township recognizes the need for new housing opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.</p> <p>Your property is located within the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt, and within a prime agricultural area. Lot creation in this area is directed by the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, which limit the opportunity for new lots for residential purposes to discourage the fragmentation of natural heritage features and prime agricultural areas.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
64.	Saif Rathor	01-Nov-23	Email	<p>The comments in the document express a desire for the following amenities near the sender's location at 790 Graham Side Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public transportation around the corner - A convenient store - A gas station 	<p>Thank you for your email and for sharing your thoughts regarding the need for public transportation, a convenient store, and a gas station near 790 Graham Side Road.</p> <p>The vision of the Official Plan is to direct growth primarily to our Villages, King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg, while maintaining the rural character of Hamlets and the countryside. Infrastructure and servicing, including transportation, are planned to align with this</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				The sender also invites further contact for additional opinions or meetings.	growth strategy and environmental stewardship goals. The Official Plan update is intended to align with the on-going and concurrent Transportation Master Plan Update. We encourage you to stay engaged with upcoming community consultation meetings.
65.	Raffaella Di Paola	November 2nd, 2023	Letter	The comments in the document consist of a letter from Raffaella Di Paola, the owner of the property at 16550 Highway 27, Schomberg, ON. She is requesting that her 73-acre parcel of land be included in the Schomberg Settlement Area for future development. The property fronts on Highway 27 and is adjacent to parcels on Lloydtown Aurora Road, close to current settlement areas. A map showing the location of the property is attached to support the request. The owner offers to provide additional information if needed.	Thank you for your comments. Staff note that these lands are located south of Lloydtown Aurora Road, and are significantly separated from the current Settlement Area boundary for Schomberg. Schomberg is a Settlement Area within the Greenbelt Plan Area. In accordance with Provincial policy, the maximum size for a Settlement Area expansion within the Greenbelt Plan Area is 10 ha. Based on current Provincial policy a Settlement Area boundary expansion to include the subject lands would not be feasible.
66.	Pasha Faraji	1/13/2024	Email	<p>The document contains a comment from Pasha Faraji expressing concern about the limited availability of major retail chains in King City, particularly in grocery shopping and general merchandise. The key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - King City currently has only one major grocery store, Coppa's, which serves the entire population. - There is a demand for more variety and increased competition in retail options. - The suggestion to attract well-established retail chains such as Walmart, Costco, Canadian Tire, Home Depot, Loblaws, and No Frills. - The introduction of diverse retail options would enhance the shopping experience, support economic development, provide more choices to consumers, and stimulate local business growth. 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding retail diversity in King City. The Official Plan Review recognizes the importance of enhancing local commercial amenities to support community satisfaction and economic vitality.</p> <p>Council's direction on intensification, employment land needs and growth management, provided in February and June 2025, has informed the policy directions outlined in the 13 Discussion Papers, including considerations for commercial land use.</p> <p>While attracting major retail chains requires careful planning, infrastructure assessment, and alignment with long-term growth objectives, your feedback helps highlight the community's desire for expanded retail options. We encourage continued participation in the Official Plan Review process as policies evolve to reflect both strategic planning goals and community needs.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- Acknowledgment that changes require thorough planning and assessment.</p> <p>- The belief that adding major retail chains will meet current community needs and attract more residents and visitors.</p> <p>- A request for the city to explore possibilities for attracting these retail chains to benefit residents and the local economy.</p> <p>- Appreciation for the city's efforts and a hope for positive developments on this matter.</p> <p>Overall, the comment advocates for diversification of retail chains to improve community satisfaction and economic vitality in King City.</p>	
67.	Josh Del Signore	5/16/2024	Email	<p>The comments provided in the document are from Josh Del Signore in response to a Growth Management Strategy Public Open House webinar. Josh thanks the team for the informative presentation and asks two follow-up questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He requests if the presentation slides or the recording can be sent to him for a more detailed review and to identify any further questions. 2. He inquires about a specific slide showing a map of King with overlays indicating approximately 2.8k units already approved or underway, and another bubble showing about 2k potential units identified through formal and informal processes. He asks for clarification on the origin of these 2k potential units, specifically whether any of them come from lots located at or near SSPA-9 to the west of Keele, either 	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the Growth Management Strategy Public Open House. Presentation slides have been uploaded to the SpeaKING Project Page. A recording from the May 2024 Growth Management Open House is also available on the SpeaKING Project Page.</p> <p>The units discussed at the May 2024 Open House as having potential or planned intensification have been formally documented and included as an Appendix to the Phase 2 Report from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. Please refer to Page 3. The site you are referring to is shown as "Potential Future Intensification" in this Appendix.</p> <p>These sites are further discussed in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification and are identified a potential intensification area. We recommend reviewing this Discussion Paper and continuing to participate in the Official Plan Review as it progresses and as draft Amendments to Our King are prepared.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>recently or in the past.</p> <p>These questions reflect a desire for more detailed information and clarification regarding the growth unit data presented in the webinar.</p>	
68.	Paige Sillcox	5/16/2024	Email	<p>The comments provided by Paige Sillcox, a lifelong King Township resident, express concerns and questions about the King Growth Management Plan. Key points include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition that the population growth forecast for King Township (from 25,300 in 2016 to 66,400 in 2051) is largely driven by immigration and accompanied by a significant increase in employment (from 9,600 to 18,300 jobs). 2. Questions about local political engagement, specifically whether any elected representatives or the mayor have objected to the growth plans. 3. Concerns about funding for infrastructure needed to support growth through 2051. 4. Clarification sought on whether new housing will be built and owned by private entities or public bodies (Township or York Region), and whether the housing will be rentals or single-family dwellings. 5. Reference to the York Region Official Plan (YROP) requirements for affordable housing units and rental units, linking this to the housing questions. 6. Doubts about the employment projections, noting that many current residents work outside King Township and that remote work is prevalent, questioning the assumption that 	<p>Thank you for your questions, comments and feedback.</p> <p>Chapters 2 and 3 of the Phase 2 Report from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. provides an assessment of the long-term growth outlook for population growth in York Region, and a population by age forecast.</p> <p>As per Figure 2-6 of the Phase 2 Report, since 2001 there has been a shift in York Region from intra-provincial migration (migration within the province) to international migration.</p> <p>Policies are being developed through the Official Plan Review to guide infrastructure considerations and housing needs. The Official Plan Review does not involve the installation of housing or infrastructure.</p> <p>The responsibility for the cost of infrastructure depends on the jurisdiction of infrastructure being conducted and/or maintained jurisdiction (i.e. Township, Regional, Provincial, etc.) Development Charges are fees levied upon growth development to help pay for costs of infrastructure required to support and service new growth. Development Charges do not fund operating, maintenance or rehabilitation costs, as those are funded by property taxes from all properties in the Township, including the new growth properties.</p> <p>Housing in the Township is generally constructed by private landowners and developers. York Region has housing projects through Housing York Inc. These are targets set out by York Region through the York Region Official Plan (YROP) 2022. Through changes in Provincial legislation</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>employment will double locally. 7. Overall concern that the Growth Management Plan represents a drastic change that may make King Township unrecognizable and is being implemented by people with no connection to the community.</p> <p>The commenter requests explanations and responses to these concerns from the Planning Department.</p>	<p>in 2024, York Region is now an upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities, and the YROP 2022 is the responsibility of the Township to administer, where the Plan applies to King. These targets will be assessed as to determine their appropriateness as the Official Plan Review progresses. In terms of whether new housing will be single family dwellings, the majority of new housing in King City is forecast to be in the form of intensification (56%).</p> <p>Having Employment Areas within the Township is beneficial as it supports the local economy, provides local jobs for residents, reduces the need for commuting, and diversifies the Township's tax base.</p> <p>York Region prepared the employment forecast for the Township for the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (PPS 2024), the Township needs to utilize this forecast as its employment forecast. Under the PPS 2024 the Township can exceed the forecast when planning for Employment Areas.</p> <p>Staff would appreciate hearing your thoughts and ideas on how growth in the Township should be accommodated to 2051.</p> <p>No decisions have been made by Council on the future Official Plan Amendments associated with the Official Plan Review.</p>
69.	Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	31-Oct-24	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Paul Brown & Associates Inc. on behalf of Fandor King-10 Holdings Inc. regarding the lands at 6675 King Road in Nobleton, Township of King, focus on the following key points:</p> <p>1. The subject lands, approximately 16.95 hectares, are currently agricultural with no structures and are located at the southeast corner of King Road and Concession Road 10.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission dated and for sharing the preliminary concept plan. The Township appreciates your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Township has reviewed and considered your submission and has incorporated the lands into the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton. Should Council endorse the Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton as presented, further refinement and secondary planning will be required for the area. The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>2. The current Official Plan designates these lands as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area."</p> <p>3. The Township's consultant recommends expanding the Nobleton Urban Area boundary by about 8 hectares for residential use and 21 hectares for employment use.</p> <p>4. Paul Brown & Associates suggest the Township consider a significant increase in employment lands expansion, particularly to the south and west of Nobleton, to attract jobs and new businesses, especially with the future Highway 413 construction nearby.</p> <p>5. Including the subject lands as employment lands within an expanded urban boundary would strategically leverage their proximity to transportation networks and employment bases, contributing to a more complete community in Nobleton.</p> <p>6. The firm expresses willingness to continue monitoring the Official Plan Review process and to engage in further discussions as needed.</p> <p>In summary, the letter respectfully requests that the Township of King incorporate the subject lands as employment lands within an expanded urban boundary in the Village of Nobleton to support growth and planning objectives.</p>	<p>process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted for the southwest quadrant of the Village Reserve.</p>
70.	John Golbalakh	11/25/2024	Email	The comment in the document is from R John Golbalakh, who requests permission to open a	Thank you for your comments concerning the subject property of 16026 7th Concession Road.

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>small food business at 16026 7th Concession Road, L7B 0E1. He explains that the area is currently residential and does not permit such businesses, resulting in no local food shops or recreational facilities. This situation forces residents, especially those with children, to travel to nearby towns like Newmarket, Aurora, Schomberg, and Vaughan for grocery shopping, sports, and other activities, which is time-consuming and costly. He emphasizes the need for more business areas in King Township to create jobs and provide convenience for residents.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your perspective on the need for additional local business opportunities to better serve the community and reduce travel for essential services. The subject property is currently designated as Hamlet Residential within the Hamlet of Pottageville, where low density residential and accessory uses are permitted. Home occupations are permitted as an accessory use to the low-density residential use in accordance with Section 3.8.5 of the current Official Plan, and the provisions of the applicable Zoning By-law.</p> <p>At this time, the preliminary policy directions for lands designated as Hamlet Residential support low-density residential development, primarily through single detached dwellings and minor infill that respects existing lot patterns and the established character of the area. No policy directions or identified needs have been provided for commercial land use permissions on the subject property. This is consistent with the Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Report, which directs commercial land uses to the designated Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg, areas where infrastructure and municipal servicing can adequately support such uses.</p>
71.	Tony Perri	9/16/2024	Email	<p>The comments from Tony Perri express concerns about a proposed condominium development on a residential lot on Wellington Street. He supports growth and development but emphasizes that it must be done properly. His main points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wellington Street is a quiet residential street that has experienced increased traffic and speeding, leading to safety concerns. - Adding a condominium driveway entrance/exit on Wellington Street would worsen traffic, 	<p>Thank you for your email and for sharing your concerns regarding the proposed condominium development on Wellington Street (File Z 2022-07).</p> <p>The Official Plan directs growth primarily to Village areas such as King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg, with a focus on intensification within built-up areas and careful management of traffic impacts and neighbourhood character. It is important to note that no Official Plan Amendment was a part of this proposal.</p> <p>A Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted through a landowner-led process and was approved by Council on September 23, 2024. The</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>safety, and noise issues, disrupting the neighborhood's character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would negatively impact property values, resident safety, and the safety of a nearby daycare play area. - The condominium would primarily benefit developers and those employed by the project, not current residents. - He considers allowing the driveway on Wellington Street as inconsiderate and bad faith business, given residents' commitment to neighborhood safety and city taxes paid. - He suggests building the condominium with access on the main road (Hwy 27) instead, to avoid impacting Wellington Street residents. - If development on Wellington Street is necessary, he recommends less impactful options like semi-detached or attached homes. - He urges city planners to prioritize the well-being and livelihoods of current residents over developer interests and to create plans that minimize traffic and safety impacts on the community. <p>Overall, Tony Perri advocates for responsible development that respects the existing neighborhood's safety, character, and residents' quality of life.</p>	<p>current status of the application is pending site plan approval. If there are further comments or questions, please direct them to the planner on file.</p>
72.	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	16-Aug-24	Letter	<p>The comments from Humphries Planning Group Inc., representing Mosaik Homes, address the implementation of affordable housing thresholds in the Township of King's 2051 Official Plan Review. They highlight that the current York Region policy, which sets an affordable</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Discussion Paper 4: Housing provides an overview and assessment of current Official Plan policies regarding affordable housing, and provides a review of the feasibility of this target in light of local economic conditions, applicant capacity, and market pressures.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				purchase price threshold at \$564,326, is not feasible for the Township of King, where the actual threshold is \$731,650. They emphasize that housing affordability is a growing issue and it is unrealistic to expect developers to provide 25% affordable housing at the lower regional threshold price. The group advises the Township to carefully review this policy matter and find an appropriate solution as part of the Official Plan Review process. They express willingness to engage in further discussions on this important topic.	<p>As part of this review, the Township is exploring alternative definitions for affordable and attainable housing, rental housing strategies, and a policy framework to enable incentive-based mechanisms such as development charge deferrals and inclusionary zoning, to support a more balanced and economically viable approach to the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>These policy directions will be translated into draft Official Plan Amendments in early 2026. We encourage your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review process and welcome ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted.</p>
73.	Sam Tabrizi	8/7/2024	Email	The comments in the document are from Sam Tabrizi, a resident of 13305 Dufferin Street, King City. Sam is requesting a review of the city's Official Plan policy regarding access to city water and sewer services. Although the city is building water and sewer lines on Dufferin Street, Sam's property is technically outside the Settlement Area Boundary, making him only eligible for partial servicing and thus ineligible for full connection to the city water. Sam's house is next to the Country Day School, which has full connection, and the water and sewer lines run in front of his home. He expresses concern that his home will never get access to city water because it lies on the east side of Dufferin, while west side houses will have full connection. He requests that the rules be modified to allow him access to city water, noting that access to the sewer line is a secondary concern since he has a septic system. Sam asks for consideration to obtain access to city water, emphasizing that his	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding access to municipal water services at 13305 Dufferin Street, King City.</p> <p>We appreciate your interest in the ongoing Official Plan update and understand your concerns about servicing eligibility given your property's location relative to the Settlement Area Boundary and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The property at 13305 Dufferin Street is zoned Oak Ridges Feature Protection. The Official Plan section 8.2.2 reflects the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and expansions of water and wastewater services outside settlement areas are not permitted. However, the Township recognizes there may be site-specific circumstances where it would be appropriate to consider flexible policies while ensuring alignment with Provincial policies, infrastructure capacity, environmental stewardship, and financial sustainability.</p> <p>We encourage you to stay engaged with the Official Plan review process and participate in upcoming public consultations.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				home is the only one in the area without access despite its proximity to connected properties.	
74.	Weston Consulting	08-Jul-24	Letter	<p>The comments provided in the document from Weston Consulting, representing Anatolia Capital Corp., regarding the Official Plan (OP) Review for 13555 10th Concession Road, Nobleton, Township of King, can be summarized as follows:</p> <p>1. Background and Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject lands are approximately 41.2 hectares (101 acres), currently agricultural, located south of 15th Side Road and east of 10th Concession Road. - The Township of King is undergoing an Official Plan Review to align with the York Region Official Plan (ROP) adopted in 2022, which directs growth to 2051. - The Township prepared an Introductory Discussion Paper seeking feedback on the future vision and direction. <p>2. Current Designations and Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject lands are designated as "Nobleton Village Reserve Area" in the Township's 2019 OP, where growth was not directed before 2031. - Under the 2022 York Region Official Plan, the lands fall within the "Towns and Villages" designation, areas intended for growth and development. - The urban boundary for Towns and Villages is to be defined in local official plans, with provisions for adjustments or expansions through local amendments and environmental 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding 13555 10th Concession</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon. Further, in accordance with Council direction from early 2025, Staff have been directed to focus the Community Area and Employment Land needs to 2051 within the southwest quadrant of the Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>However, Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Anatolia Capital Corp. property.</p> <p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>assessments.</p> <p>3. Provincial Legislative Changes: - Bill 23 and Bill 185 have shifted planning approval authority from York Region to the Township of King for Official Plans and amendments, effective July 1, 2024. - These changes aim to accelerate housing development and improve consultation and certainty.</p> <p>4. Servicing Constraints and Environmental Assessment: - The 2019 OP limited the Nobleton Urban Area boundary due to local water and wastewater servicing constraints. - A Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) completed in 2021 addressed servicing upgrades to accommodate future growth within the existing urban boundary. - No urban expansion beyond the current boundary is planned in the 2019 OP.</p> <p>5. Growth Projections and Recommendations: - The ROP anticipates a 161.4% population growth in the Township by 2051. - Weston Consulting recommends including the subject lands within the Nobleton Urban Area Boundary to support this growth. - They argue this inclusion aligns with updated provincial policies, supports housing targets, and ensures conformity with the Regional Official Plan and other provincial policies.</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>6. Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weston Consulting expresses willingness to discuss the matter further and monitor updates to the Official Plan review and provincial policies. - They will prepare additional submissions as public input opportunities arise. <p>In summary, Weston Consulting advocates for the inclusion of the subject lands in the Nobleton Urban Area Boundary during the Township of King's Official Plan Review to facilitate growth, housing development, and alignment with regional and provincial planning frameworks.</p>	
75.	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	13-May-24	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Humphries Planning Group Inc. on behalf of Iron Construction and Development Inc. regarding the 2051 King Township Official Plan Review focus on the following key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation: Humphries Planning Group Inc. represents Iron Construction and Development Inc., owners of lands at 3501 and 3565 King Road, totaling approximately 18.6 hectares in the southwest quadrant of Highway 400 and King Road. 2. Land Designation: The land is located within the Hamlet of Laskay and designated as Hamlet Commercial and Hamlet Rural Area according to Schedule E2 of the Towns 2019 Official Plan. 3. Land Attributes: The land's proximity to a full interchange at Highway 400 suggests that 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 3501 and 3565 King Road.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 10: King's Hamlets, provides an overview of the policies for King's Hamlets, including the Hamlet of Laskay. In terms of 3501 and 3565 King Road, these lands are within the current Hamlet boundary and are designated Hamlet Rural Area and Hamlet Commercial.</p> <p>Staff recognize the potential of the site to redevelop for Hamlet Employment, Commercial and Residential uses over the 2051 planning horizon, particularly due to the proximity of the site to the Highway 400 and King Road interchange, and King City.</p> <p>Should Council endorse the directions outlined in the Discussion Paper and October 27, 2025 Report to Council, the Project Team will continue to work with the commenter and landowner to further discuss the appropriate land use designations for the lands, potential for a hamlet site-specific policy area, and the protection and enhancement of the natural heritage system.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>higher order land uses should be considered for this area.</p> <p>4. Request for Study: They request that this area be subject to a detailed study as part of the Official Plan Review process to determine an appropriate mix of land uses and municipal servicing opportunities.</p> <p>5. Meeting Request: They seek a meeting with the Official Plan Review project team to discuss these comments and requests in detail.</p> <p>6. Communication: They ask to be notified by the Town on the next steps of the 2051 Official Plan Review as they unfold.</p> <p>The letter is signed by Rosemarie L. Humphries, President of Humphries Planning Group Inc., and is copied to various officials including the Mayor, Council members, and relevant township staff.</p>	
76.	Andrew Miskiv	Thu 5/2/2024	Email	<p>The comments in the document are from Andrew Miskiv, representing the owner of 20 Centre Street in Lloydtown, regarding the King Township Official Plan Review. The key points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They seek sewer and water service extension into Lloydtown from the Forestbrook Phase 2 Development in Schomberg, which is nearby. 2. They propose amalgamating Lloydtown Hamlet into Schomberg and rezoning all Hamlet Residential (HR) areas as R1B. 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments regarding Lloydtown.</p> <p>The Township recognizes the need for new housing and growth opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.</p> <p>Within King's Countryside and Hamlets, the majority of lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or Greenbelt Plan</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>3. They emphasize the importance of designing the sewer and water extension to accommodate future connections.</p> <p>4. They note that the 2020 Transportation Master Plan and Official Plan support road widening and bus service to accommodate Schomberg growth, rather than building a bypass road, to preserve the hamlet's character.</p> <p>5. Lloydtown is closer to Schomberg than other hamlets and lacks access to clean water and sewers, so the plan should maintain high living standards for Lloydtown residents.</p> <p>6. Soft densification of Lloydtown would benefit the environment by eliminating aging septic systems and preserving greenbelt or agricultural lands.</p> <p>7. Many Lloydtown lots are too small for new septic systems and have conservation setbacks, so sewer and water extension would help improve homes.</p> <p>8. The lots can accommodate additional soft density to meet provincial housing needs sustainably, promoting a low-carbon, walkable neighborhood rather than car-centric suburban sprawl.</p> <p>Overall, the comments advocate for infrastructure improvements and planning changes to support sustainable growth and environmental protection in Lloydtown.</p>	<p>Area. For Lloydtown, the Hamlet is located entirely within the Greenbelt Plan Area. The Greenbelt Plan provides policy direction for lot creation that the Township's policies must conform with. Under the Greenbelt Plan, municipal servicing can generally not be extended outside of the Villages, including to Hamlets. Further, the Greenbelt Plan does not permit the extension of Hamlet boundaries or the amalgamation of a Hamlet into a Settlement Area (Village).</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We encourage you to stay engaged in the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
77.	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	02-May-24	Letter	The comments provided by KLM Planning Partners Inc. on behalf of Prebrick System Corp. c/o Treasure Hill Homes address the Township of King Official Plan review. They highlight	Thank you for your submission on behalf of Prebrick System Corp. c/o Treasure Hill Homes

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>concerns about the current permitted residential density in the Township of King, which allows a maximum of 12 units per gross residential hectare, or 7 units per hectare if specific criteria are not met. The letter notes that the York Region Official Plan sets a population target of 66,400 by 2051, with the Township of King expected to accommodate 31,500 people from 2031 to 2051.</p> <p>Historically, the Nobleton Community within the Township has had low density and population due to infrastructure challenges and a preference for larger lots. However, these infrastructure challenges are reportedly being addressed with the involvement of Prebrick System Corp. The letter argues that encouraging larger lots is no longer appropriate under current Provincial Planning legislation and policy.</p> <p>Comparisons are made to similar communities in York Region, such as Keswick and East Gwillimbury, which permit higher residential densities ranging from 20 to 40 units per hectare. Based on these comparisons and anticipated population growth, the letter requests that the Township of King incorporate a residential density range of 20 to 30 units per hectare for new developments in the Nobleton Community. This increased density is seen as necessary to provide diverse housing options, efficient land and infrastructure use, and to align with provincial policy.</p>	<p>The June 2024 Office Consolidation of the York Region Official Plan revised King’s population forecast to 51,000 by 2051, with Nobleton expected to accommodate 13,580 residents, 27% of the Township’s total. In response to anticipated growth and evolving Provincial Planning legislation, the Township is considering new density rates and reviewing land use designations to support diverse housing forms and efficient infrastructure use. This is explored in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification.</p> <p>Further, Council has endorsed a minimum density rate of 35 people and jobs per hectare for new greenfield areas, which will guide future development.</p> <p>The Township welcomes continued dialogue to ensure the Official Plan reflects a balanced and forward-looking approach to growth.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
78.	Property owners of 2440 Kind Rd., 2430 King Rd., 2420 King Rd., 2410 King Rd., 2400 King Rd.	29-Jan-24	Letter	<p>The document contains a letter dated January 29, 2024, from property owners of several addresses on King Road (2440, 2430, 2420, 2410, and 2400 King Rd.) addressed to the King township Planning Division. The letter expresses strong support for the upcoming Official Plan Review (OPR) study focused on low-rise residential or mixed-use redevelopment in the Village Site-Specific Policy Area 9 (V-SSPA-9), specifically the land fronting King Road between John Street and Charles Street.</p> <p>The homeowners emphasize that their properties consist of older structures with large lot sizes, making them suitable for redevelopment. They agree with the township's initiative to rezone the area as a low-rise, high-density residential zone to accommodate population growth driven by federal and provincial mandates. They note that nearby lands have already been or will be zoned for low or high-rise residential use, with construction underway on some projects.</p> <p>The letter highlights that the homeowners have gathered signatures to show their collective support, believing the redevelopment will benefit local businesses within walking distance, increase the township's tax base, and enhance property values for homeowners. The letter is signed by five property owners from the mentioned King Road addresses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence dated January 29, 2024, expressing support for the Official Plan Review (OPR) study concerning low-rise residential or mixed-use redevelopment within Village Site-Specific Policy Area 9 (V-SSPA-9) along King Road between John Street and Charles Street.</p> <p>These lots within V-SSPA-9 have been formally documented and included as an Appendix to the Phase 2 Report from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. as a potential or planned intensification area. Please refer to Page 3. The site you are referring to is shown as "Potential Future Intensification" in this Appendix.</p> <p>These sites are further discussed in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification and are identified a potential intensification area. We recommend reviewing this Discussion Paper and continuing to participate in the Official Plan Review as it progresses and as draft Amendments to Our King are prepared.</p>
79.	Angela Ventrice	22-Mar-24	Email	The comment suggests attracting young families to the area by developing a few traditional	Thank you for your suggestion regarding the introduction of traditional townhomes to attract young families to the area. The Township of

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				townhomes, similar to a small project previously done by Caliber Homes. The idea is to create a small pocket of such homes to appeal to this demographic.	<p>King recognizes the importance of providing diverse and attainable housing options to support a vibrant, inclusive community.</p> <p>Our Official Plan update to 2051 emphasizes a balanced approach to growth management, including a targeted increase in medium-density residential development such as townhouses, particularly within the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas. This aligns with our goal to shift from predominantly low-density housing toward a more diverse housing mix, more than 50% of new residential development focused on intensification within built-up areas.</p> <p>We appreciate your reference to projects like those by Caliber Homes and will continue to explore opportunities for small-scale, well-designed townhouse developments in our Villages. Your input supports our commitment to creating complete communities that offer a range of housing choices for all ages and income levels, including affordable and attainable options.</p>
80.	Abbas Assadian	Mon 2/26/2024	Email	The comments in the document express support for King Township's proactive efforts to update the official plan to accommodate population growth while preserving community essence and minimizing environmental impact. The commenter, Abbas Assadian, urges a shift towards a development model that benefits both developers and residents, emphasizing sustainability and resident well-being. He advocates for empowering residents through lot creation initiatives in underutilized rural areas to align new developments with existing neighborhood character, foster community ownership, and improve access to essential services like natural gas, water, high-speed internet, and insurance in an environmentally friendly manner.	<p>Thank you for your input regarding the King Township Official Plan review. We appreciate your recognition of the Township's proactive efforts to accommodate population growth while preserving the community's character and minimizing environmental impact.</p> <p>King Township remains deeply committed to balancing growth with sustainability, as reflected in our vision to maintain an idyllic countryside community that treasures its rural heritage and natural environment. Our Official Plan directs growth primarily to the Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg, with limited and carefully managed development in Hamlets and rural areas. This approach supports community identity and environmental stewardship while fostering a responsible local economy.</p> <p>Regarding your suggestion to encourage lot creation by residents in underutilized rural areas, we acknowledge the importance of aligning new development with existing neighborhood character and</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>enhancing access to essential services. However, the Official Plan currently restricts lot creation in agricultural and rural areas to protect prime agricultural lands, natural heritage features, and to comply with Provincial policies such as the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. These protections are vital to sustaining the Township's environmental and agricultural integrity.</p> <p>We continue to explore innovative and inclusive housing strategies, including intensification within built-up areas and a diverse housing mix to meet the needs of all residents. Our commitment to environmental sustainability, infrastructure alignment, and community engagement remains central to the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
81.	Faresh Somai	Thursday, December 28, 2023	Email	<p>The comment in the document is an email from a resident named Faresh Somai expressing concerns about the water supply situation on Lloydtown-Aurora road between highway 27 and highway 400 (Pottageville). The comments highlight that many residents rely on well water systems, which require costly maintenance including water filters, UV light bulbs, water softener salt, and RO systems.</p> <p>The commenter notes that some residents struggle to afford these costs and that there is also an issue with low water pressure. The comments request the recipients to consider the possibility of installing municipal water supply to improve water quality and reduce the high maintenance costs associated with well water systems. The commenter expresses willingness to discuss the matter further and thanks the</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and for sharing your concerns regarding the availability of servicing in this area of the Township.</p> <p>Municipal water and wastewater servicing is only available in the Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg. Within the Villages, all new development shall be on the basis of municipal sewage services and municipal water services.</p> <p>Outside of the Villages there are very limited opportunities to extend municipal servicing, and generally only to lands immediately abutting the boundary of a Village. Further, the extension of lake-based servicing is not permitted within the Greenbelt Plan area.</p> <p>As such, the extension of municipal servicing to this area is not feasible at this time or supported by Provincial, Regional or Township policy. The Township promotes the safe and effective maintenance of individual private wastewater systems in order to protect groundwater and surface water quality.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				recipients for their work, wishing them happy holidays.	
82.	Peelar Farms	12/18/2023	Email	The comment in the document is from Jason Peelar of Peelar Farms. He is requesting that his farm, located at 6600 15th Sideroad, Schomberg, be included in the official plan review of Bill 23. He also asks to be kept informed about the study and any progress related to Bill 23. Contact details are provided for further communication.	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The <i>More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022</i> (Bill 23) is a key piece of provincial legislation introduced to accelerate housing development across Ontario. It implements significant changes to the land use planning system, including amendments to the Planning Act, Development Charges Act, and Conservation Authorities Act. Among its provisions are the allowance of up to three residential units per lot in most urban areas, reductions in development charges for certain housing types, and limitations on site plan control.</p> <p>While Bill 23 establishes province-wide requirements, King Township's Official Plan Review is a separate and comprehensive process aimed at updating the Township's long-term planning framework to the planning horizon of 2051. Through this review, the Township will incorporate applicable changes introduced by Bill 23.</p>
83.	Ramtin Biouckzadeh	10/30/2023	Email	The comment in the document expresses support for allowing land severance in the township of King. The commenter is in favor of enabling the creation of detached homes to accommodate the rising population but opposes the development of condominiums and townhouses.	<p>Thank you for your email regarding land severance and housing preferences in King. The growth management considerations for the Official Plan Review are guided by Council's direction on housing and population growth forecasts from February and June 2025. These considerations have informed the policy directions outlined in the 13 Discussion Papers released in September 2025. These directions aim to balance growth management objectives with housing diversity, infrastructure capacity, and community character.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					While the creation of detached homes through land severance may support population growth, the Township must also consider a range of housing forms, including townhouses and condominiums, to meet evolving demographic needs and provincial planning objectives. Your feedback is appreciated and will be considered as policies are refined to support a complete and inclusive community.
84.	Fareba Assadian	10/29/2023	Email	The comments in the document express support for new housing development in King City and surrounding areas to accommodate population growth. The sender advocates for opportunities to build estate homes on larger parcels of land, especially in rural areas, to maintain the city's green and rural character. They suggest that promoting estate homes with acreage can prevent large subdivisions, preserve green space, and still allow for more housing and tax revenue. The sender also recommends easing restrictions on severing lands in rural areas to help current residents, not just developers, and believes this approach will discourage developers from creating dense subdivisions while keeping the area attractive and green.	<p>The Township recognizes the need for new housing opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.</p> <p>Within King's Countryside, the majority of lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or Greenbelt Plan Area. These Provincial Plans provide policy direction for lot creation that the Township's policies must conform with. Under these Plans, lot creation for residential purposes, including estate subdivisions, are generally prohibited as it promotes the fragmentation of agricultural lands and natural heritage features, and increases the disturbance on these priority areas of the Province.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We encourage you to stay engaged in the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
85.	Abbas Assadian	27-Oct-23	Email	The comments provided by Abbas Assadian regarding the official plan review for King Township express support for accommodating population growth through new housing. Abbas emphasizes the importance of encouraging estate homes on larger rural lands to preserve the city's green and rural character. He suggests that building estate homes with acreage can	The Township recognizes the need for new housing opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				prevent large-scale subdivisions and maintain the area's appearance. Abbas also highlights that converting large parcels into a few estate homes is preferable to developers subdividing land into many houses, which could reduce green space. He recommends that King Township consider easing restrictions on severing lands in rural areas to help current residents, not just developers. Overall, the focus is on balancing growth with preserving green space and the rural image of the city.	<p>Within King's Countryside, the majority of lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or Greenbelt Plan Area. These Provincial Plans provide policy direction for lot creation that the Township's policies must conform with. Under these Plans, lot creation for residential purposes, including estate subdivisions, are generally prohibited as it promotes the fragmentation of agricultural lands and natural heritage features, and increases the disturbance on these priority areas of the Province.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We encourage you to stay engaged in the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
86.	Charles Cooper	26-Sep-23	Letter	<p>The comments in the document express appreciation for the efforts of staff involved in the Official Plan Review and acknowledge the complexity of managing numerous interrelated planning documents. The author highlights the challenges faced by King Township due to frequent and sometimes contradictory changes imposed by upper-level governments, describing this as a Sisyphean task. While commending King Township's reasonable management of growth and the progress made over the past decade, the author expresses concern about losing these gains due to recent provincial policy changes outlined in Bills 23, 97, 108, and 109. Specific worries include reduced responsibilities of conservation authorities, diminished ability for urban design reviews, accelerated timelines, and potential development in Greenbelt areas. The author looks forward to providing further input and collaborating with Council and staff to help King Township thrive in the future.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We acknowledge your concerns regarding recent provincial policy changes, including those introduced through Bills 23, 97, 108, and 109, and their implications for conservation authority responsibilities, urban design review processes, and the protection of Greenbelt lands.</p> <p>We welcome ongoing dialogue to collaboratively address concerns. Your feedback is essential to informing the development of the Amendments, particularly as we work to integrate updated provincial policy. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p> <p>Thank you again for your engagement and support. We look forward to continued collaboration as we advance the Official Plan Review process.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
87.	Larry Morra	26-Sep-23	Email	<p>The comments in the document are from Larry Morra, who wishes to register for a meeting on September 26, 2023.</p> <p>The commenter owns four properties in Schomberg, Ontario, including homes and vacant lands totaling several acres. The commenter plans to move into one of these properties next year. They express a desire for the area to develop into a fuller community with town water, sewage, employment opportunities, and amenities. The comments note that they have owned some properties for five years and feels that Schomberg has not yet reached the level of development and growth that many people have envisioned.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding properties in proximity to the urban boundary of Schomberg. Schomberg is one of King's three Villages. The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy and Official Plan Review all direct growth to the Villages to support the efficient use of infrastructure and the creation of complete communities.</p> <p>Staff note that the properties identified in your comments are located outside of the urban boundary of Schomberg, and are within the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt. In accordance with Provincial policy, municipal water and wastewater servicing cannot be extended to these properties.</p> <p>In terms of opportunities for future growth, the Township's Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Report and its Addendum, outlined that Schomberg has sufficient greenfield lands to accommodate its forecasted population and housing growth to the 2051 planning horizon. The analysis confirms that Schomberg's Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) is expected to be fully built out by 2051, with no additional land required to meet residential demand.</p> <p>The Township's housing supply data indicates that Schomberg has approximately 80 units of greenfield housing potential, which aligns with its modest growth forecast of 320 new households over the period. Further, under the policies of the PPS the Township is not able to plan for Community Area growth beyond the 30-year horizon. Therefore, Schomberg is not forecast to have a deficit in greenfield land supply, and no urban expansion is required for residential purposes.</p> <p>A settlement area boundary expansion for Schomberg is being investigated for Employment Area uses. A Natural Heritage Background Study is currently underway to assess the appropriateness and suitability of the proposed expansion. A report to</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					Council is targeted for December 2025 to present this Report and proposed policy directions related to natural heritage.
88.	Weston Consulting	25-Sep-23	Letter	<p>The comments provided by Weston Consulting on behalf of Anatolia Capital Corp. regarding the Official Plan (OP) Review for the lands at 13555 10th Concession Road in the Township of King can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> **Subject Lands Description**: The lands are approximately 41.2 hectares (101.8 acres) located southeast of the 15th Sideroad and Concession Road 10 intersection within the settlement boundary of Nobleton. The lands have frontage on Concession Road 10 and are surrounded by agricultural lands, with a low-rise residential neighborhood and a recently approved subdivision nearby. **Planning Policy Context**: The lands are designated as Nobleton Village Reserve in the Township's OP and are outside the current urban area boundary, which restricts urban development until 2031. However, these lands are considered appropriate for long-term growth beyond 2031 through future OP amendments. The lands are underutilized and adjacent to existing and approved residential subdivisions. **Development Potential and Servicing**: Weston Consulting has engaged with Township and Regional staff to explore development opportunities and servicing expansion. However, current Environmental Studies have not considered extending municipal servicing 	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding 13555 10th Concession.</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon. Further, in accordance with Council direction from early 2025, Staff have been directed to focus the Community Area and Employment Land needs to 2051 within the southwest quadrant of the Nobleton Village Reserve.</p> <p>However, Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Anatolia Capital Corp. property.</p> <p>Thank you again for your input and collaboration in shaping the future of King Township.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>beyond the Township's Urban Area, limiting development potential until the planning horizons of 2041 (Region) and 2031 (Township).</p> <p>4. **Review of Introductory Discussion Paper**: Weston Consulting supports the Township's OP Review objectives to promote complete communities and accommodate significant population and employment growth by 2051. They emphasize the strategic location of the subject lands within the settlement boundary and adjacent to existing development, offering an opportunity to accommodate growth through expanded servicing and infrastructure.</p> <p>5. **Policy Considerations**: The current OP policy (Policy 5.16) restricts urban uses in the Nobleton Village Reserve until 2031, but the OP Review should consider allowing urban uses beyond 2031 based on future needs, policy direction, and servicing availability. Weston Consulting supports policies that encourage partnerships among stakeholders to plan and provide infrastructure efficiently.</p> <p>6. **Housing Needs**: The subject lands can contribute substantially to meeting the Township's housing needs by providing a mix of housing types and tenures, supporting the Province's housing supply targets and the Township's growth forecasts.</p> <p>7. **Conclusion**: Weston Consulting is supportive of the Township's direction to</p>	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>accommodate growth to 2051 and believes the subject lands are suitable for substantial housing development. They argue that allowing development on these lands is logical, compatible, and consistent with surrounding land uses. They request to be kept informed of future OP Review meetings and decisions.</p> <p>Overall, the comments advocate for the inclusion of the subject lands within the urban boundary and support their development to help meet long-term growth and housing needs in the Township of King.</p>	
89.	Sylvia Nalepka	22-Sep-23	Letter	<p>The comments submitted by Sylvia Nalepka for the King Official Plan Review highlight concerns about inequitable allocation of resources and services for seniors across the three main towns in the Township of King. She points out that while Schomberg and King City have well-established, dedicated senior facilities and amenities, Nobleton, with approximately 1,500 seniors, lacks a dedicated space for senior activities. The current use of the arena displaces senior activities, and seniors have lost a previously allocated space for government-supported babysitting services.</p> <p>Sylvia emphasizes the importance of providing a dedicated space to encourage senior participation and support a healthy, independent lifestyle. She raises concerns about the accessibility of the newly built \$22 million King City facility for Nobleton seniors, noting transportation challenges and physical and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The preliminary policy directions in the <u>Complete Communities Discussion Paper</u> recommend integrating the Township's Parks, Facilities, and Trails Master Plans into the Official Plan to support growth and evolving community needs. For parks, the focus is on maintaining service levels, clarifying the role of privately owned publicly accessible spaces (POPS), and ensuring parkland around intensification areas remains functional and accessible. Facility planning emphasizes lifecycle management, co-location, adaptive reuse, and equitable access, while trail policies promote design standards, maintenance, accessibility, and network expansion through partnerships.</p> <p>We will provide your comments to our Facilities and Recreation teams, as the Township is undertaking an update to its Parks, Facilities and Trails Master Plan. A draft of this Plan has been released on the <u>SpeaKING Project Page</u>. It may be beneficial to get involved with this Plan to provide your comments directly to the Project Team on the facilities that you feel would benefit Nobleton. The findings of the Master Plan, and other ongoing Master Plans and Township projects</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>cognitive constraints that limit their ability to travel there.</p> <p>An open house meeting in Nobleton focused on recreational initiatives, including plans for outdoor sports fields and a proposed 13,000 square-foot library with a dedicated senior space. However, there are community concerns about whether the new library will have sufficient indoor space to accommodate educational and daily activity needs for all age groups, especially seniors.</p> <p>She commends the Township's strategy to fund new developments through local land sales but stresses the need to ensure seniors have access to suitable indoor spaces within their own community. Sylvia highlights the town's rapid growth and warns that delaying action on these disparities could widen the gap in services available to residents.</p> <p>Overall, she urges the Township to address these imbalances now to benefit current and future residents, enhance quality of life, and demonstrate leadership in equitable resource distribution.</p>	<p>will be incorporated into the Official Plan Review as it progresses.</p> <p>To learn more about the Parks, Facilities and Trails Master Plan, visit the SpeakKING Project Page here.</p>
90.	Humphries Planning Group Inc.	3-Feb-25	Letter	<p>The comments provided in the document from Humphries Planning Group Inc. on behalf of Nobleton Valley Inc. request the Township of King to reconsider including the Nobleton Valley Inc. lands within the 2051 boundary of the King Township Official Plan Review. The key points are:</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission dated February 3, 2025, regarding the Nobleton Valley Inc. lands (Part 1, 65R-35161).</p> <p>The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy identified the Township's Community Area needs to the 2051 planning horizon. In accordance with the PPS 2024, the Township is unable to plan for Community Area needs beyond a 30-year planning horizon.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nobleton Valley Inc. owns approximately 100 acres located immediately west of the existing built boundary. - The property offers an opportunity to extend existing community lands through existing cul-de-sacs, including Witherspoon Way. - The property has extensive frontage on the 10th Concession, which supports efficient extension of servicing and additional transportation routing connectivity within the Village area. - The request is based on a review of the Town's background discussion policy papers and attendance at the Nobleton Community Open House on January 29th. - The letter formally asks the Town to reconsider the inclusion of these lands within the 2051 boundary for the reasons noted above. <p>The second page is a detailed survey plan of the property in question, showing its location and boundaries relative to surrounding lots and roads.</p>	<p>Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve, identifies that the entirety of the Village Reserve should be subject to a secondary planning exercise following the completion of the Official Plan Review to provide clarity in future land uses for the Reserve lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon, and to inform the next Official Plan Review. Staff recommend participating in that process should you wish to continue to pursue long-term Community Area uses for the Nobleton Valley Inc lands.</p>
91.	Nils Corneman	1/30/2025	Email	<p>The comments provided by Nils Corneman in the document regarding the Township of King Official Plan Review Draft focus on three main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Living in King: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for housing provision across King Township, emphasizing the need to maintain the rural community's unique character and avoid uninspired, plain designs like the new Zancor 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Since the release of the January 2025 Discussion Papers, Council has provided direction on growth management and employment land considerations, which informed the policy directions outlined in the 13 Discussion Papers that were released in September 2025. These Discussion Papers can be found on the SpeakKING Project Page.</p> <p>These Discussion Papers include updated considerations for the Nobleton Village Reserve, including a Concept Plan for future land use in the southwest quadrant, and updated Transportation</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preference for Option 3 to redesignate land from Nobleton's Village Reserve for new residential community due to its proximity to the new 413 highway and employment lands, and to reduce traffic in Nobleton and King Road. - Advocacy for "complete communities" with improved traffic flow, including widening Hwy 27 and King Road to four lanes, while preserving the charm of Schomberg's Main Street without causing congestion. <p>2. Working in King:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for Option 1 to redesignate land from Nobleton Village Reserve for employment uses, keeping employment areas near major arteries with good highway access. - Agreement with expanding Schomberg's settlement boundary to accommodate new employment uses without impacting homes. - Encouragement to expand population-related employment uses in village centers to attract visitors and local spending, while acknowledging traffic congestion challenges. - Concern about avoiding issues seen in Bolton and Caledon where warehousing and trucking have caused congestion and regulatory problems, urging to keep such operations out of King Township. <p>3. Moving and Connecting in King:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong opposition to redirecting goods movement traffic north of Nobleton to 15th Sideroad due to congestion and road conditions. 	<p>considerations in alignment with the Township's ongoing Transportation Master Plan Review.</p> <p>We appreciate your input and encourage your continued engagement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- Proposal to direct goods movement traffic south to connect with Hwy 413, with two options: expanding 10th Concession and King Vaughan Line or building a new access road off King Road west of Nobleton.</p> <p>- Suggestion to rebuild King Vaughan Line to handle all traffic levels and cancel the 15th Sideroad connection across Hwy 400.</p> <p>- Emphasis on shared cost and cooperation among government levels and municipalities for infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Overall, the comments emphasize preserving the rural character, improving traffic flow and infrastructure, supporting thoughtful housing and employment growth, and avoiding congestion and negative impacts seen in neighboring communities.</p>	
92.	Abbas Assadian	18-Jan-25	Email	<p>The comments in the document focus on growth strategy for King Township. Abbas Assadian shares insights from a friend with urban development expertise, highlighting concerns about Toronto's growth plan, particularly aging and inadequate sewage infrastructure. He warns that without proper sewage planning, the city's growth strategy may fail, potentially leading to opening the Greenbelt for development.</p> <p>For King Township, Abbas suggests distributing growth between urban and rural areas rather than concentrating it in three designated towns. He advocates for spreading growth across rural areas where homes use septic systems, which could ease infrastructure challenges. He</p>	<p>The Township recognizes the need for new housing opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.</p> <p>Within King's Countryside, the majority of lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or Greenbelt Plan Area. These Provincial Plans provide policy direction for lot creation that the Township's policies must conform with. Under these Plans, lot creation for residential purposes, including estate subdivisions, are generally prohibited as it promotes the fragmentation of agricultural lands and natural heritage features, and increases the disturbance on these priority areas of the Province.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>emphasizes controlled development with modern, environmentally friendly septic systems to enhance sustainability, protect water resources, maintain rural landscape integrity, and reduce environmental degradation.</p> <p>This approach aims to balance growth, preserve the township's rural character, reduce pressure on urban infrastructure, prevent rural overdevelopment, and support responsible land use and environmental stewardship. Abbas expresses interest in feedback on these ideas.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We encourage you to stay engaged in the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
93.	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	08-Jan-25	Letter	<p>The document is a submission from SGL Planning and Design Inc., representing Fandor Homes – Via Moto Inc., requesting the inclusion of lands at 6190 to 6230 King Road, Nobleton, in an expanded Nobleton Village Core as part of the Our King Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Key points from the comments:</p> <p>1. Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subject lands are currently designated as Neighbourhood in the Township's Official Plan. - The site is approximately 0.45 hectares with 133 meters frontage on King Road. - It is vacant, previously considered for residential use, but lacks servicing allocation for residential units. - Surrounding context includes townhouses to the north, vacant lands west, and large 	<p>Thank you for your comments and observations.</p> <p>The Township acknowledges your points regarding servicing capacity, noting that while capacity is not assigned to commercial uses, infrastructure must still support future commercial growth. Population-related employment is forecast to be the largest contributor to King's employment growth through 2051, and the Township is exploring commercial land needs through designated Commercial areas as well as Mixed-Use and Core Area policies.</p> <p>Live-work units are currently permitted in the Neighbourhood designation. The lands referenced in your comments are identified in Appendix C of the Phase 2 Watson Report as suitable for intensification. Further, Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, identifies these lands as a potential intensification area. The Official Plan Review will assess the appropriate land use designation to support new land uses on this site while ensuring compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>residential properties south across King Road.</p> <p>2. Rationale for Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Servicing availability: Opportunity for infill development with neighbourhood commercial uses that do not require servicing allocation. - Watson and Associates Phase 1 Growth Management Strategy (Aug 29, 2024): Nobleton lacks sufficient vacant Employment Area land to meet 2051 employment targets. Commercial uses on the subject lands would contribute to population-related employment growth and help address employment land deficits. - Proximity to existing Village Core: The lands are about 115 meters west of the current Village Core, with limited intervening lots, making them suitable for small-scale commercial development. - Neighbourhood context: The lands are relatively isolated from sensitive uses, bordered by streets and a stormwater pond, with no direct abutting residential designations if included in the Village Core. - Complete community: Extending the Village Core westward would provide commercial uses within an 800-meter radius (15-minute walk), improving accessibility and meeting day-to-day needs of west Nobleton residents. <p>3. Additional considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future development would follow urban design guidelines to maintain Nobleton's character, promoting smaller scale 'main street' style commercial uses with appropriate parking. 	

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>- The client is considering live-work residential units on undeveloped lands west of Tomlinson Gate to aid transition between designations.</p> <p>- A trail connection through the stormwater block would enhance walkability.</p> <p>Summary: The submission argues that the subject lands are well-suited for inclusion in an expanded Village Core to better serve west Nobleton's community needs, support employment growth, and reinforce complete community principles with accessible commercial uses. The site's location on an arterial road limits impacts on residential areas. The request is made for consideration as part of the Township's Official Plan update.</p>	
94.	Dentons Canada LLP	06-Dec-24	Letter	<p>The document is a letter dated December 6, 2024, from Diana Doracin, an associate at Dentons Canada LLP, addressed to Denny Timm, Township Clerk of King City. The letter states that Dentons represents Flato Developments Inc. and Wyview Group regarding the Township of King's Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review. The letter requests to be notified of any items, reports, meetings, or decisions related to the Town Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review. The letter offers contact information for any questions. There are no specific comments or detailed feedback provided in this letter; it is primarily a formal request for ongoing notice and communication.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. You have been added to the interested parties list and will be notified of any items, reports, meetings, or decisions related to the Official Plan Review as the project progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
95.	Dentons Canada LLP	26-Nov-24	Letter	The document is a letter dated November 26, 2024, from Diana Doracin, an associate at Dentons Canada LLP, addressed to Mr. Denny Timm, Township of King Clerk. The letter states that Dentons represents Lucyna and Przemyslaw Przbylski regarding the King Township Official Plan Review for properties at 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane, King City. The letter requests to be notified of any items, reports, meetings, or decisions related to the Township Official Plan. The sender offers to be contacted for any questions.	Thank you for your submission. You have been added to the interested parties list and will be notified of any items, reports, meetings, or decisions related to the Official Plan Review as the project progresses.
96.	Carol Rawa	17-Sep-25	Comment Form	The comments provided by Carol Rawa, a resident of King Township, focus on two main concerns related to the Official Plan Review discussion papers on Economic Development and Employment, and Transportation. Carol inquires about the possibility of new plazas or grocery stores opening in King City, noting the current limited options and lack of diversity, which forces residents to travel to nearby towns for grocery shopping. Additionally, she asks whether there will be any new bus routes added and seeks information on the expected start date for the extension of 15th Sideroad to Jane Street. Carol attended the King City open house for this consultation.	<p>Thank you for your thoughtful comments regarding retail diversity in King City. The Official Plan Review recognizes the importance of enhancing local commercial amenities to support community satisfaction and economic vitality.</p> <p>Council's direction on intensification, employment land needs and growth management, provided in February and June 2025, has informed the policy directions outlined in the 13 Discussion Papers, including considerations for commercial land use.</p> <p>While attracting major retail chains requires careful planning, infrastructure assessment, and alignment with long-term growth objectives, your feedback helps highlight the community's desire for expanded retail options.</p> <p>In terms of transit provision, York Region has recently expanded its transit on-request services for King. On-Request North-Central can take you from an address to/from a YRT route or another address where a YRT route is not available in the service area. For more information visit: https://www.yrt.ca/en/schedules-and-maps/North-Central.aspx</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>Regarding transportation, the Official Plan emphasizes a multi-modal network and a Complete Streets approach to improve connectivity and accessibility. The extension of 15th Sideroad to Jane Street is an opportunity that is being considered as part of King's ongoing Transportation Master Plan to support growth and improve traffic flow. A decision has not been made by Council regarding this project, and as such there is no specific timeline associated with it. To learn more about the Transportation Master Plan please visit: https://speaking.king.ca/transportation-master-plan-2.</p> <p>We encourage continued participation in the Official Plan Review process as policies evolve to reflect both strategic planning goals and community needs.</p>
97.	Namvar Vahidi	17-Sep-25	Comment Form	The comments provided express full support for the proposed intensification plan for future projects in King City. The commenter believes this initiative will bring significant benefits such as more efficient land use, enhanced housing options, and long-term economic growth. They respectfully request that the City seriously consider incorporating this intensification into the upcoming Official Plan review to ensure clarity and encourage responsible development aligned with the City's vision for sustainable growth. The comment was submitted by Namvar Vahidi, a landowner in King Township, regarding the property at 2400 King Rd, and was associated specifically with the "Intensification" discussion paper. The commenter attended the King City open house.	<p>Thank you for your correspondence expressing support for the Official Plan Review (OPR) study concerning low-rise residential or mixed-use redevelopment within Village Site-Specific Policy Area 9 (V-SSPA-9) along King Road between John Street and Charles Street.</p> <p>These sites are further discussed in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification and are identified a potential intensification area. We recommend reviewing this Discussion Paper and continuing to participate in the Official Plan Review as it progresses and as draft Amendments to Our King are prepared.</p>
98.	Anne And Peter Waldon	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided by Anne and Peter Waldon express appreciation for the planning efforts for King's growth and acknowledge the	Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>necessity of intensification. However, they disagree with the specific plans for townhomes on Kingslynn/Patton and the four-storey building at the Elizabeth Grove site. They argue that the property at King and Patton, already zoned for three single-family homes, fits the neighborhood's character, which includes spacious lots, mature trees, and family-oriented design, and that the proposed intensification does not suit this stable interior area.</p> <p>Regarding Memorial Park, they highlight its importance as the only park in the area with increasing use by families and sports players. They prefer preserving the Eva L. Dennis property to maintain and enhance park facilities, such as parking, picnic areas, and sports courts, to protect green space.</p> <p>They also raise concerns about parking and increased traffic, noting frequent parking issues on Kingslynn that hinder driveway access and emergency vehicle access. They emphasize that local roads were designed for local traffic and question how the added traffic from townhomes or low-rise apartments will be managed, as many neighborhoods already face similar issues.</p>	<p>Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.
99.	Blaire Brown	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Blaire Brown, a resident of King Township, focus on the intensification plan for the King Square Block Plan area between King Rd, Dew Street, William St, and King Blvd. Blaire strongly opposes the designation of this neighborhood, directly in front of the elementary school, as a village core or strategic growth area for high-density development. They advocate for maintaining the block as a medium to low-density neighborhood with lower-storey townhomes, multiplex homes, or single-family homes, which are more suitable for families with school-aged children.</p> <p>Blaire emphasizes the importance of preserving the area's proximity to the elementary school, library, and high school, highlighting the neighborhood as an ideal "walkable village/community" for young families. They argue that mid to high-rise apartment buildings are inappropriate for this location due to existing traffic congestion and safety concerns for children walking or biking to school. Additionally, Blaire expresses concern that high-density housing and long-term construction would</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the King Square Block Plan. This block of land is designated Village Core in the current Our King Official Plan, which was adopted by Council in September 2019. The Village Core designation permits mixed-use buildings and commercial uses, as well as residential uses, specifically townhouses and apartments. Further, the minimum height for new buildings shall be two functional storeys, and the maximum height for new buildings is generally three storeys. However, this designation may permit development up to six storeys, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The Block Planning exercise for this area is privately led by landowners and is subject to Township File No. FSDAS-20-01. This application proposes a variety of unit types and development forms that will be subject to a Council decision at a future date. The application is currently in its 3rd submission, and is targeted to advance to Council for further review in mid-2026. Should a decision of Council be rendered in advance of the adoption of the amendments to the Official Plan, it will be incorporated into the final Official Plan. We encourage your continued participation in both the Official Plan Review, and the block plan application review process.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>exacerbate traffic issues and negatively impact the community around the elementary school.</p> <p>In summary, Blaire urges the city to reconsider the plan for this specific block, recommending lower or medium-density housing options such as townhomes to protect the neighborhood's character, safety, and suitability for families.</p>	
100.	Brian Walker	02-Oct-25	Comment form	<p>The comments provided in the document are from Brian Walker, a resident of King Township and owner of the property at 13120 Keele St. He notes that during the creation of the current official plan, the land use designation for his property was initially mixed use but was changed back to existing residential at the last moment, likely due to controversy over a townhouse project on the east side of Keele St. He inquires whether there is any consideration to adjust the designation on four neighboring properties, which have 80 houses, to mixed use as originally proposed by the planners. The comment is associated with the discussion paper on "Intensification" and was submitted after attending the King City open house.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding 13120 Keele Street.</p> <p>The Township supports intensification as a key strategy to accommodate growth efficiently, diversify housing options, and optimize infrastructure use in alignment with Provincial and Regional planning policies. To the 2051 planning horizon, across the Township, over 50% of new housing is forecast to be in the form of intensification.</p> <p>Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, identifies locations for potential intensification. 13120 Keele Street is within a potential intensification area that is forecast to accommodate lower-medium density developments, such as townhomes, duplexes and triplexes.</p> <p>We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional feedback as the project progresses.</p>
101.	Christine Giambattista	01-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Christine Giambattista, a landowner in King Township, express strong opposition to the proposed intensification plan for the Kingslynn/Patton and Elizabeth Grove areas. She argues that these areas are inside a well-established, stable interior neighborhood characterized by spacious lots, mature trees, and family-oriented design, which is incompatible with the proposed</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>townhomes and four-story buildings. She suggests that single detached homes would be more appropriate for the three lots currently designated as such, and that the site adjacent to these lots could be used as a park extension and parking area. Christine raises concerns about traffic, road safety, and the misalignment of multi-story buildings with the neighborhood character, especially near the church. She emphasizes that these sites are not along major roads and lack the necessary infrastructure for intensification. She also mentions a community petition against the intensification and urges the council and planning to recognize and protect the interior streets as stable residential areas, excluding them from the intensification plan. She attended the King City open house and requests that the community's objections be heard and respected.</p>	<p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
102.	Dan Stone	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Dan Stone, an agent representing a land or business owner in King Township, focus on supporting the commentary under Section 2.2 of the Servicing Discussion Paper titled "Servicing Our Communities." The key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to clarify criteria for servicing extensions beyond the boundaries of Villages and urban boundaries established in the Official Plan. - A specific recommendation to modify and amend Section 8.3.2 of the "Our King" Official Plan (2019) during the current Official Plan Review process. - The proposed amendment would allow the extension of water and sanitary services beyond Village boundaries to facilitate existing approved development, critical economic development projects, and other uses deemed in the general public interest by the Council. - The extension of servicing should not impact the existing community or planned development within the Village boundary. <p>The comment was submitted following attendance at the Schomberg Open House and signed on October 2, 2025.</p>	<p>Thank you for your continued participation in the Official Plan update. The Project Team recognizes there may be site-specific circumstances where it may be appropriate to consider flexible servicing policies while ensuring alignment with Provincial policies, infrastructure capacity, environmental stewardship, and financial sustainability. Your comments have also been shared with the Township's Public Works Department for their consideration as they update King's Water and Wastewater Master Plan. Updates to this Master Plan will also inform policy updates to the Our King Official Plan.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review as policy is drafted.</p>
103.	Darlene Mitrakos	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Darlene Mitrakos, a resident of King Township, express strong opposition to the proposed intensification plans for the Kingslynn/Patton area. Specifically, she opposes the development of 13 high-density townhomes and a 4-story seniors building at the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Elizabeth Grove Church site, arguing that these do not fit the character of the existing low-density neighborhood. She advocates for maintaining low-density residential homes, suggesting that only 5 low-density homes would be appropriate for the lots in question. She emphasizes that intensification should be limited to main streets leading into King City and that existing low-density neighborhoods should be preserved as they are, as this is what residents appreciate about King City.</p>	<p>accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
104.	Dean Orr	22-Sep-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express support for the vision statement of King's Township, which emphasizes responsible growth while preserving rural charm and agricultural heritage. The commenter, a resident of King Township, appreciates the focus on</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the Vision for King as part of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>We acknowledge your support for a vision statement that emphasizes that King grows responsibly preserving the rural charm and</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>maintaining King's rural character through smart, compact growth and supporting the agricultural sector. They attended the open house in Nobleton and highlighted the importance of investing in a strong local economy and vibrant community spaces.</p>	<p>agricultural legacy, while investing in a strong local economy and vibrant places for all.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
105.	Ellesha C	01-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express concern about the intensification plans in King Township, specifically regarding the Kingslynn/Patton area. The commenter, a resident of King Township, attended the King City open house and focused on the "Intensification" discussion paper. They argue that the local park is intended for community members and local traffic, not for supporting a high density of houses. They highlight that Patton Street is already congested with fast cars and shortcuts, and adding more houses will worsen this problem. Additionally, they oppose the construction of a four-storey building that would overshadow a small church and nursery school, stating that such development does not align with the vision for King Township.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
106.	Faresh Somai	24-Sep-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document are from a resident of King Township named Faresh Somai, who is interested in the property on Lloydtown Aurora Road. The comment specifically relates to the discussion paper on "Servicing Our Communities." The resident attended the Open House in Schomberg and expressed a concern about the availability of municipal water in their area, noting that well water and its maintenance are becoming too expensive. They are seeking information on</p>	<p>The Township recognizes the need for new housing opportunities in King. Residential growth is primarily forecast within the three Villages of King City, Nobleton, and Schomberg where infrastructure and services can support intensification and complete communities. This strategy helps to ensure that growth is managed, phased, and aligned with servicing capacity, while protecting the countryside and agricultural economy.</p> <p>Within King's Countryside, the majority of lands are within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or Greenbelt Plan Area. These Provincial Plans provide policy direction for lot creation that the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				when municipal water can be expected in their area.	<p>Township's policies must conform with. Under these Plans, lot creation for residential purposes, including estate subdivisions, are generally prohibited as it promotes the fragmentation of agricultural lands and natural heritage features, and increases the disturbance on these priority areas of the Province.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We encourage you to stay engaged in the ongoing Official Plan review process.</p>
107.	Grace Yu	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided in the document are from Grace Yu, a resident of King Township, who attended the King City open house. The comments express appreciation for the opportunity to meet with different departments of King Township and discuss the Official Plan Review. Specifically, she commented on Discussion Paper 12, "Servicing Our Communities," highlighting her support for prioritizing safe drinking water. The commenter emphasized the importance of addressing	Thank you for your continued participation in the Official Plan update. The Project Team recognizes there may be site-specific circumstances where it may be appropriate to consider flexible servicing policies while ensuring alignment with Provincial policies, infrastructure capacity, environmental stewardship, and financial sustainability. Your comments have also been shared with the Township's Public Works Department for their consideration as they update King's Water and Wastewater Master Plan. Updates to this Master Plan will also inform policy updates to the Our King Official Plan.

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				serious health and environmental concerns related to nearby new developments. The commenter hopes that residents affected by these developments can apply for the extension of municipal water services (partial municipal service) to ensure peace of mind during and after the construction period.	The Project Team encourages your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review as policy is drafted.
108.	James Levac	25-Sep-25	Comment Form	The comments provided in the document are from James Levac, an agent representing a land or business owner in King Township, regarding the Official Plan Review discussion paper on Economic Development and Employment. He expresses disappointment with the lack of acknowledgment and response to previous submission letters made on behalf of the property owner for the site at 12480 Weston Road. He questions the planning rationale for leaving this site as the only remaining White Belt site in the municipality. He requests that these lands be considered for future Employment uses due to their proximity to proposed Employment areas in the City of Vaughan and the Highway 400 corridor. The comment was submitted after attending the open house in Nobleton.	<p>Thank you for your submission regarding the 2051 King Township Official Plan Review for the lands at 12480 Weston Road.</p> <p>The Township has previously identified the lands on the east side of Weston Road that are within the Whitebelt for a future settlement area for Employment Area purposes. However, since the preparation of the Discussion Papers Staff have recognized the benefits of looking at the entirety of the Whitebelt comprehensively.</p> <p>The October 27, 2025, Report to Council and associated proposed Policy Directions identify the need to recognize all the Whitebelt lands as within a site-specific policy area for further study as a new settlement area for Employment Area land uses. This would include the portion of 12480 Weston Road that is outside of the Greenbelt.</p> <p>Should Council endorse these policy directions, the draft amendments to Our King will include the proposed policies and the delineation of the site-specific policy direction in early 2026.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to remain involved in the Official Plan Review process and welcomes ongoing dialogue and collaboration as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>
109.	Larry Morra	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided by Larry Morra focus on the need for equitable treatment and growth opportunities for all communities within King Township, with a particular emphasis on	Thank you for your comments regarding Schomberg and Lloydtown. Schomberg is one of King's three Villages, while Lloydtown is a Hamlet. The Township's Growth Management and Employment Land Strategy and Official Plan Review all direct growth to the Villages to

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>Schomberg and Lloydtown. Larry expresses concern that some communities are being favored over others and that the proposed plans are insufficient to support current and future needs, especially for Schomberg.</p> <p>Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schomberg lacks a strong residential and economic base to become a sustainable, well-rounded community. - There is a need for a stronger residential commitment, supported by intensification and continued industrial and employment land use, to bolster downtown and commercial development along Highway 27. - The commercial and service industries require more focus on downtown historic destinations. - The Schomberg/Lloydtown area has a rich history that could be better capitalized on, including improved community identification through signage at key intersections to welcome and direct traffic. - Expansion of industrial and employment sectors in Schomberg is natural and would create jobs and residential growth, especially by extending boundaries along Highway 27 and connecting north and south areas. - Existing infrastructure, including water and waste treatment, can support this growth. - Residential intensification should follow the pattern of older Lloydtown, with more public spaces, green walkways, specialty residential options like retirement and assisted living, and affordable housing opportunities for young 	<p>support the efficient use of infrastructure and the creation of complete communities.</p> <p>Staff note that the properties identified in your comments are located outside of the urban boundary of Schomberg, and are within the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt. In accordance with Provincial policy, municipal water and wastewater servicing cannot be extended to these properties.</p> <p>In terms of opportunities for future growth, the Township's Phase 2 Growth Management and Employment Lands Strategy Report and its Addendum, outlined that Schomberg has sufficient greenfield lands to accommodate its forecasted population and housing growth to the 2051 planning horizon. The analysis confirms that Schomberg's Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) is expected to be fully built out by 2051, with no additional land required to meet residential demand.</p> <p>The Township's housing supply data indicates that Schomberg has approximately 80 units of greenfield housing potential, which aligns with its modest growth forecast of 320 new households over the period. Further, under the policies of the PPS the Township is not able to plan for Community Area growth beyond the 30-year horizon. Therefore, Schomberg is not forecast to have a deficit in greenfield land supply, and no urban expansion is required for residential purposes.</p> <p>A settlement area boundary expansion for Schomberg is being investigated for Employment Area uses. A Natural Heritage Background Study is currently underway to assess the appropriateness and suitability of the proposed expansion. A report to Council is targeted for December 2025 to present this Report and proposed policy directions related to natural heritage.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>people close to Toronto. - The review is seen as an opportunity to create a new vision for Lloydtown/Schomberg that promotes prosperity, sustainability, and a progressive approach to industry and community development.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding increased signage, community identification, and recognition of the historic downtown. We will share these comments with the Township's Economic Development Division and Heritage Staff.</p> <p>We appreciate your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review and encourage your continued involvement as the Review progresses.</p>
110.	Malcolm Graham Bridges	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document relate to the Official Plan Review for the Township of King. The commenter, Malcolm Graham Bridges, a landowner in King Township, expressed interest specifically in the topic of "King's Countryside" as part of the discussion paper. The comment indicates an interest in property severance for existing, independent properties. The commenter attended the Open House in King City and submitted the feedback on October 2, 2025.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding 15435 7th Concession.</p> <p>15435 7th Concession is located within the Natural Heritage System of the Oak Ridges Moraine and as such is subject to the policies of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). While the PPS 2024 provides a framework for considering a technical severance, it is important to note that in accordance with the PPS 2024 Provincial Plans, such as the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, build upon the policy foundation of the PPS, and take precedence over the policies of the PPS to the extent of any conflict, except where the relevant legislation provides otherwise.</p> <p>As such, the proposed lot creation at 15435 7th Concession should be considered in the context of the policies of the ORMCP which does not have a framework for a technical severance. Instead, lot creation would be required to conform to the policies of Section 32 of the ORMCP.</p> <p>The Project Team encourages you to review the proposed lot creation in the context of the policies of the ORMCP. As the Official Plan is already consistent with these policies of the ORMCP, if the proposed severance application is consistent with the policies of the ORMCP then an amendment or site-specific policy area to Our King would not be required to facilitate the proposed lot creation. However, if the proposed severance is not consistent with these policies of the ORMCP then the Project Team would not be able to support a site-</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					specific policy to Our King as the Official Plan is required to conform to the ORMCP.
111.	Mark Rapus	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Mark Rapus, a resident of King Township, focus on two main areas of the Official Plan (OP) review: Natural Heritage and Transportation.</p> <p>1. Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The OP should prioritize public transit and non-motorized transit options such as walking and biking. - When new roadways are constructed or existing roads are upgraded, traffic calming measures should be considered during the design stage. - Traffic calming assessments should include criteria to identify if a roadway is adjacent to or within a natural feature or part of a natural linkage area. - Traffic calming should enhance safety not only for people but also for other species using the landscape. <p>2. Natural Heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Natural Heritage System (NHS) must be enhanced and protected. - The OP should include a goal to expand the NHS through the planning approval process. - A target for an expanded NHS should be identified within the OP. - The expansion of the NHS should be a collaborative effort involving the two Conservation Authorities, King Township, York Region, and private landowners. 	<p>Thank you for your comments submitted as part of the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The support for prioritizing public transit and non-motorized transportation modes such as walking and biking is acknowledged. The Transportation Discussion Paper, released as part of the Official Plan Review proposes stronger policies for walking, cycling, and transit access in all new developments. It also promotes traffic calming and Complete Streets design to improve safety for people and reduce vehicle speeds, especially in village cores.</p> <p>Thank you for your suggestions for obtaining a target for an expanded NHS being identified in the Official Plan. The <u>Natural Heritage Discussion Paper</u> proposes undertaking a Comprehensive Natural Heritage Study to identify opportunities for enhancement and expansion of the NHS. This Natural Heritage Background Study is currently underway, and will be presented to Council concurrent with proposed natural heritage policy directions in December 2025.</p> <p>Preliminary policy directions include protecting and enhancing ecological connectivity, applying road ecology best practices to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions, and integrating green infrastructure into land use planning. A target for increased canopy and woodland cover is proposed in alignment with the Township's ongoing Tree Management Plan, with recommendations to incentivize planting on private lands and monitor gains and losses through development.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				Overall, the comments emphasize integrating transportation planning with natural heritage protection and promoting collaboration among stakeholders to enhance and expand the Natural Heritage System.	participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.
112.	Michael Iamonaco	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided in the document are from Michael Iamonaco, a resident of King Township, regarding the Official Plan Review for the Township of King. His comments focus on two specific sites: the old Eva L. Dennis school site on Kingslynn/Patton and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The city's plan proposes medium-density housing for these sites, including 13 three-storey townhomes on Kingslynn/Patton and a four-storey seniors building on Elizabeth Grove. Michael and others in the community express concern that these proposals do not align with the existing community's character, which predominantly consists of low-rise, single-family dwellings on spacious lots. They feel the current proposals neither fit the community's feel nor its character. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on "Intensification" and "Housing" and were submitted following attendance at the King City open house.	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.
113.	Mohammad Shamshiri-Tehrani	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express the view of a resident of King Township regarding infrastructure and development needs. The key points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The property east of Dufferin/Fifteen Sideroad up to the intersection of Bathurst and Fifteen Sideroad should be connected to water and sewer services. - The road in this area needs to be lighted and improved to create a safer route for residents. - Fifteen Sideroad should no longer be considered a rural road due to increased development. - There is a need to connect Richmond Hill to King City and new developments east of Dufferin, as residents will use this road to access homes, services, and larger roads. - The size of the road east of Bathurst should be compared to Bloomington and Fifteen Sideroad to assess adequacy. - Overall, there is a call for city water and sewer services and road improvements to support the growing residential needs in this area. <p>The comment was submitted by Mohammad Shamshiri-Tehrani, a resident of King Township, who attended the King City open house and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding servicing and transportation between King City and Richmond Hill. The lands east of Dufferin Street and west of Bathurst Street are located in the Township, and are within the Oak Ridges Moraine. As they are outside of a settlement area, Provincial policy generally does not support the extension of municipal water and wastewater servicing to these lands.</p> <p>In terms of transportation improvements, the portion of 15th Sideroad between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street is within the Township, and is classified as an arterial road. Improvements to this stretch of road would be subject to the direction of York Region's Transportation Master Plan. York Region's Transportation Master Plan was last updated in 2022, and the recommendations and directions of this Plan will be incorporated into the Township's Official Plan as the Review progresses. In terms of the land east of Bathurst Street, these lands are within the City of Richmond Hill and are not subject to the policy directions of the Township's Official Plan Review.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				referenced the discussion papers on "The Vision for King," "Housing," and "Servicing Our Communities."	
114.	Nadia Venafro	01-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Nadia Venafro, a resident of King Township, focus on concerns about the proposed intensification in the interior of the neighborhood, specifically regarding townhomes on Kingslynn/Patton and a four-storey building at Elizabeth Grove. Nadia highlights that Memorial Park is the only park serving the entire area and is not equipped or planned to handle increased traffic resulting from intensification. She suggests that other areas in King, particularly along major roads, are better suited for growth and intensification rather than squeezing it into existing interior areas. Additionally, she expresses concern about the removal of much-needed park space, which was sold to the municipality at a minimal fee to be used by the community. Nadia recommends revisiting the 2018 approach to making this park space a valued community asset. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on the vision for King, complete communities, intensification, and housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p> <p>In addition, the Township is currently undertaking a review of its Parks Master Plan, which looks at parkland needs and park amenities. More information on the Parks Master Plan can be accessed here: https://speaking.king.ca/king-township-recreation-parks-and-culture-master-plan-update. We encourage you to participate in this project as well to express your recommendations regarding Memorial Park and park spaces as community assets.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
115.	Nick Mitrakos	01-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Nick Mitrakos, a homeowner in King Township, express concern about the planned construction of townhomes in his neighborhood on Kingslynn Drive. He emphasizes that the area currently consists of low-density, single dwellings, and the proposed townhomes do not align with the established neighborhood character. He suggests that such townhomes would be more appropriate along major corridors like Keele or King Road, where similar homes exist. Nick finds it disheartening that available land is being used for development despite local opposition. He supports maintaining park spaces that serve community needs, such as soccer fields, tennis</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>courts, and baseball diamonds. Additionally, he notes that a previous plan for the corner of Patton and Kingslynn Drive involved building three lots with similar homes, which he agrees with. Overall, he requests that the concerns of current residents be acknowledged and that alternative development options fitting the community plan be considered.</p>	<p>Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
116.	Taraneh Rangiantehrani	17-Sep-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express strong support for the proposed intensification plan for future development opportunities in King City. The commenter, a resident of King Township named Taraneh Rangiantehrani, believes that this approach will benefit the community by promoting smarter land use, offering a wider range of housing choices, and fostering sustainable economic growth. The commenter encourages the City to thoughtfully consider including this intensification strategy in the upcoming Official</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support regarding intensification in King City. As outlined in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, the Province requires municipalities to support intensification to meet housing and infrastructure goals, including gentle density in existing neighbourhoods. Township Council also endorsed an intensification target of 56% for King City in June 2025.</p> <p>The majority of higher-density development is directed to the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas where infrastructure and services can support more compact growth.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				Plan review to guide responsible development and ensure that growth in King City aligns with the long-term vision for a vibrant and sustainable community. The comment is specifically associated with the "Intensification" discussion paper and was submitted following attendance at the King City Open House.	Your feedback is valuable in ensuring that intensification is implemented thoughtfully. We encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.
117.	Tiffany Canzano	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Tiffany Canzano, a resident of King Township, focus on concerns about proposed townhouse units at the corner of Kingslynn Drive and Patton Street, as well as a proposed Senior's Residence in the community. Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The townhouse units do not align with the neighborhood's character, which consists of low-density single-family homes on spacious lots with mature trees and high property values. - The land would be better used to expand facilities at Memorial Park or for constructing single-family homes consistent with the area. - The proposed townhomes would significantly increase traffic on already congested and dangerous local roads, which lack adequate traffic calming measures and sidewalks. - Memorial Park experiences congestion during sports events, and the surrounding roads cannot support additional traffic. - Infrastructure in the area is outdated, with an old culvert system and utility services that would require costly updates, causing prolonged construction and impacting residents' quality of life. - The area is not designed to support the traffic 	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>and pressures that the townhouse development would bring, potentially driving out current residents attracted to the community's low density and quiet nature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar traffic concerns apply to the proposed Senior's Residence. - Intensification should be focused along major roads rather than interior suburban roads, as the current proposals do not significantly contribute to the overall intensification goals and would adversely affect the community and residents. <p>Overall, the comments express strong opposition to the proposed townhouse and Senior's Residence developments due to concerns about traffic, infrastructure, community character, and quality of life impacts.</p>	<p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
118.	Tony Giambattista	01-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Tony Giambattista, a 13-year resident of the Springhill community in King Township, express concerns about the proposal to intensify the old Eva L. Dennis school property and the church on Elizabeth Grove. Tony believes this proposal is not suitable for the well-established community. He highlights that Memorial Park, which has served as a community hub with events and limited parking, should be expanded into the old school property to provide more green space, parking, and possibly a permanent stage for events.</p> <p>Tony emphasizes that the three residential lots on Patten Road should remain as single-family homes with a minimum width of 75 feet, opposing the idea of 20-foot townhouse lots,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>which he feels would lead to mass intensification and alter the community's unique character. He also suggests that the church property on Elizabeth Grove should maintain single-family 75-foot lots.</p> <p>While acknowledging the need for intensification in areas like King Road and Keele Street, Tony urges that the Springhill community be preserved as it has been for the past 60 years, noting it is a sought-after neighborhood attracting young families due to its ample green space.</p>	<p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>
119.	Vince Mirarchi	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Vince Mirarchi, a resident of King Township from the Springhill Community, express concerns about the integration of high-density housing into existing low/medium density neighborhoods in King City, particularly around Springhill. He notes that the community has been established since the 1950s and has become a sought-after neighborhood in Ontario. Vince emphasizes that living in King is expensive and not affordable, and he questions how the official plan intends to make high-density housing "affordable" in areas surrounded by multi-million dollar homes. While not opposed to intensification, he argues that King has ample land available for development and cautions against damaging the character of established communities. He urges the use of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about intensification in King City. As outlined in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, the Province requires municipalities to support intensification to meet housing and infrastructure goals, including gentle density in existing neighbourhoods. Township Council also endorsed an intensification target of 56% for King City in June 2025.</p> <p>In existing and established neighbourhoods, intensification and gentle density will primarily take the form of additional residential units, with the potential to consider semi-detached dwellings or duplexes on corner lots, where they can integrate sensitively into the neighbourhood while preserving their character.</p> <p>The majority of higher-density development is directed to the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas where infrastructure and services can support more compact growth.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				common sense and advises against integrating high-density housing into existing neighborhoods unnecessarily, highlighting that King is not like Toronto, where land is scarce. He also points out that if infrastructure is a concern, the city typically places that responsibility on developers. Overall, Vince advocates for preserving the roots and attractiveness of King Township by focusing development on available land rather than altering established communities.	Your feedback is valuable in ensuring that intensification is implemented thoughtfully. We encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.
120.	Wayne Kitchen	02-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Wayne Kitchen, a landowner in King Township, focus on concerns related to the proposed commercial development along Highway 9 on Lot 35 Concession 8. The key points raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The neighboring properties, including the commenter's own on Lot 34, rely on wells for water, and the water table in the area is quite high. - Lot 35 contains several flowing springs. - There is concern about protecting the water table and neighboring wells from contamination if development is allowed. - The water flows through a culvert under the 8th concession into the Pottageville swamp conservation area. - The commenter mentions a beaver dam that was removed near the culvert in recent years and questions what steps will be taken to protect the water flow from contamination. <p>Overall, the comment emphasizes the need for</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>At this time, the Township is in the process of undertaking a Natural Heritage Study to determine if natural heritage features are present on the lands, and to assess their suitability in accommodating employment uses. The results of the Natural Heritage Study will be presented to Council in December 2025.</p> <p>Should Council endorse the subject lands for potential employment land designation, any future development proposal submitted by the landowner will require a detailed environmental review.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				careful consideration and protective measures regarding water resources and environmental impact in the context of the proposed commercial development.	
121.	Bonnie Tang	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided by Bonnie Tang, an agent representing a land or business owner in King Township, focus on the property located at 5780 King Road in the Village of Nobleton. The property is currently designated as an established Neighbourhood but is adjacent to lands designated as Institutional to the east and Mixed Use to the south of King Road, with Village Core lands further west. Bonnie requests that the Township consider redesignating the subject property as Village Core. This redesignation is intended to support the Township's objective of achieving more social-related employment uses and rental apartment units. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on Complete Communities, Housing, and Economic Development and Employment, and were submitted following attendance at the King City Open House.	<p>Thank you for your comment. 5780 King Road in Nobleton is currently designated Established Neighbourhood. However, it is our understanding that there has historically been a mixed-use building located on the site.</p> <p>While 5780 King Road is not currently identified within an area of potential intensification in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, due to its frontage on King Road, it's existing use, and proximity to the Village Core and Neighbourhood Plan Study Area, the Project Team will continue to explore the appropriate land use designation for the site. A more fulsome update will be provided as the Official Plan Amendments are drafted. We encourage your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p>
122.	Dan Stone	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided in the document are from Dan Stone, an agent representing a land or business owner in King Township. The subject property of interest is located at Pt Lot 24 - Concession 9 Schomberg SE Corner Of Dr Kay And Cooper Drive. Dan attended the Schomberg open house and provided feedback related to the following discussion papers: Complete Communities, Intensification, Housing, and Economic Development and Employment.	<p>Thank you for your comment. It is our understanding that this site previously obtained approvals for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to facilitate the development of four (4) townhouse dwellings. The site is also adjacent to lands designated Mixed Use that currently support a commercial plaza.</p> <p>Staff will continue to consider the request to redesignate the lands from Neighbourhood to Mixed-Use through the Official Plan Review. Staff note that the Mixed-Use designation is consistent with the previous Council approvals and would continue to allow for</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				The main comment is a request to redesignate the lands in question from "Neighbourhood" within the Built Boundary on Schedule D3 of the Our King Official Plan to "Mixed Use." This change is sought to allow for minor scale commercial uses that support the community, along with opportunities for residential apartments on the second floor of a commercial building.	<p>townhouses, while also providing flexibility to accommodate commercial uses or a mixed-use building.</p> <p>We encourage your continued involvement in the Official Plan Review.</p>
123.	J Belair	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided express strong opposition to the intensification plans in King City, particularly in the established single-family core area. The commenter, a resident of King Township, argues that intensification is being imposed by the provincial government without regard for local neighborhood characteristics. They highlight that the existing spacious lots, mature trees, single-family homes, and low-traffic roads are unsuitable for multi-unit residences. The commenter also points out that traffic is already chaotic and unmanageable in and around King City. They emphasize that growth should not occur in the inner, original neighborhoods, as many projects are already proposed, underway, or abandoned on King Road and Keele Street. The overall message is a call to rethink and avoid using inner areas for intensification to preserve the character and livability of King City.	<p>Thank you for your comments about intensification in King City. As outlined in Discussion Paper 3: Intensification, the Province requires municipalities to support intensification to meet housing and infrastructure goals, including gentle density in existing neighbourhoods. Township Council also endorsed an intensification target of 56% for King City in June 2025.</p> <p>In existing and established neighbourhoods, intensification and gentle density will primarily take the form of additional residential units, with the potential to consider semi-detached dwellings or duplexes on corner lots, where they can integrate sensitively into the neighbourhood while preserving their character.</p> <p>The majority of higher-density development is directed to the Village Cores and Mixed-Use areas where infrastructure and services can support more compact growth.</p> <p>Your feedback is valuable in ensuring that intensification is implemented thoughtfully. We encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>
124.	Jack Campbell	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided by Jack Campbell, a resident of King Township, focus on the proposed Official Plan's approach to new development. He requests that new development be concentrated within existing	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the proposed settlement area boundary expansions for King City and Schomberg.</p> <p>In terms of Schomberg, this location option has been considered due to its frontage on Highway 9, and its proximity to existing municipal</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>village boundaries without expanding into the surrounding Natural Heritage Areas. Specifically, he highlights concerns about the Schomberg map showing boundary expansion for employment into the Greenbelt on the south side of Highway 9, extending potentially to Concession 8. He suggests that more suitable lands adjacent to existing servicing and major highways (Hwy 27 and Hwy 400) should be considered instead. Additionally, he points out a proposed incursion into the Greenbelt for King City commercial expansion at the southeast corner of King Road and Highway 400, which he describes as a "thin edge of the wedge" that could lead to continuous development along Highway 400 north and south of King Road. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on Complete Communities, Intensification, and Natural Heritage, and were submitted following attendance at the Schomberg Open House.</p>	<p>servicing in Schomberg. The landowner has also expressed interest in the lands being used for Employment purposes, which benefits the Township as should the lands be re-designated, there would be the potential for the employment uses to be developed in a timely manner rather than remaining vacant. The location is also beneficial as it would primarily route any potential truck traffic along Highway 9, rather than along Highway 27 and through the Village of Schomberg.</p> <p>However, the Project Team recognizes the challenges associated with this proposed settlement area boundary expansion due to the presence of potential natural heritage features, and its inclusion within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt. A Natural Heritage Study is currently underway for the lands, and consideration of the settlement area boundary expansion will be subject to a future report to Council, targeted for December 2025.</p> <p>The proposed King City settlement area boundary expansion is proposed to address a population-related (commercial) land shortfall for King City. This site has been carefully selected based on criteria for settlement area boundary expansions in the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan. This site is outside of the Natural Heritage System, and is designated Rural in the Plans, not prime agricultural area. The lands on the north side of King Road that are referred to in your comment are within the prime agricultural area, and partially within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area. The sites further south along Jane Street are within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt and contain natural heritage features. As such, there are limited other locations that can be considered for a settlement area boundary expansion, unless changes are made to policies at a Provincial level.</p> <p>However, similar to the location option for Schomberg, a Natural Heritage Study is underway to determine the suitability of this site for commercial uses. The settlement area boundary expansion will be subject to a future report to Council, targeted for December 2025.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
125.	Jeff Cecilio	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document are from Jeff Cecilio, a resident of King Township, regarding the Official Plan Review for the Township of King. Jeff's feedback specifically addresses the intensification plan related to the Kingslynn/Patton plan. He opposes the intensification plan, particularly objecting to the proposal of a four-storey building on top of the church on Elizabeth Grove. Jeff attended the King City open house and submitted his comments on October 3, 2025.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
126.	Jessica Jakubowski, an agent representing landowners Lucyna and Przemyslaw Przybylski, owners of 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane, King City.	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document are submitted by Jessica Jakubowski, an agent representing landowners Lucyna and Przemyslaw Przybylski, owners of 255 and 275 Lloyds Lane, King City.</p> <p>The comments are related specifically to the discussion paper titled "9. King's Countryside" as part of the Township of King's Official Plan Review. Jessica refers the reader to a separate letter sent to Mr. Stephen Naylor dated October 3, 2025, for detailed comments on the Official Plan Review Discussion Papers on behalf of the property owners.</p> <p>The submission was made following attendance at the Schomberg Open House. No specific comments are included directly in the form; instead, the letter mentioned contains the substantive feedback.</p>	<p>Thank you for your correspondence regarding the lands municipally known as 255 Lloyds Lane. These lands are located north of the Hamlet of Pottageville, and are within the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan areas.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.2.1 of Discussion Paper 9: King's Countryside, the Official Plan Review is exploring the appropriateness of revising lot creation policies for Rural lands in the Greenbelt Plan Area. In accordance with policy 3.1.4.5 of the Greenbelt Plan, municipal Official Plans are permitted to be more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan with respect to severances on Rural lands. The Greenbelt Plan currently permits the creation of a single lot for residential development on Rural lands within the Greenbelt Plan area, provided they comply with the minimum distance separation formulae, do not impact or fragment key natural heritage or key hydrologic features, and do not extend or promote strip development. Under the current policy framework an Official Plan Amendment application would be required to facilitate this form of lot creation, provided the proposal conforms with this policy of the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>Staff note that should King's Official Plan be amended to permit this form of rural lot creation, while the portion of the property on Lloyds Lane that is within the Greenbelt Plan area is designated Rural and Protected Countryside, it is also within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan. A comprehensive natural heritage review would be required to ensure that the proposed lot creation would not result in the fragmentation of natural heritage or hydrologic features.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and we encourage your continued involvement as the Official Plan Review progresses.</p>
127.	Joe Rotiroti	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	The comments provided express strong opposition to the intensification plan proposed	Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>for King Township, specifically in King City and the Kingshawn and Patton areas. The resident, Joe Rotiroti, who has lived in the community for 10 years, feels the plan lacks vision and foresight and threatens the tight-knit community fabric. He acknowledges past acceptance of certain developments but believes the current proposals, such as adding 3-story townhomes and multiple new homes along main roads, are inconsistent with the community's character. He also raises concerns about inadequate infrastructure planning, such as street lighting, pedestrian safety, speed control, and traffic management. Overall, he urges the township to reconsider the intensification approach to better serve the interests of current residents.</p>	<p>former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					The Township values transparent and meaningful dialogue with residents and all interested parties. We are committed to ongoing consultation and carefully considered all feedback in preparing the proposed policy directions. We encourage you to continue participating in upcoming engagement opportunities and to share any additional insights as the project progresses.
128.	Mary Muter	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Mary Muter, representing a ratepayers association for Kingscross Estates in King City, express concerns about the proposed Official Plan (OP) for King Township. Key points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kingscross Estates has significant natural features such as deep ravines, streams, wetlands, and is part of a Provincially Significant Wetland Complex with many lots having conservation easements that prevent development. - The landform has not been altered, and much of the land is not developable due to these conservation easements. - Historically, there has been opposition to developing Kingscross due to its natural features. - The new OP's suggestion to allow intensification (increased housing density) in Kingscross is viewed as a mistake because the fragile landscape cannot support it. - Estate lots in Kingscross are not affordable housing and should be recognized as a unique housing type. - A recent attempt to build two houses on one lot in Kingscross highlighted problems with setbacks and limited land for septic systems and 	<p>Thank you comments regarding the Official Plan Review and the proposed policies affecting Kingscross Estates in King City.</p> <p>The Our King Official Plan (2019) Village Site-Specific Policy Area 4 (V-SSPA-4) in the Our King Official Plan applies to the Kingscross Estates neighbourhood in King City. The site-specific policies under to require a minimum lot area is designed to preserve the established estate residential form, ensuring that future development maintains the area's low-density nature.</p> <p>We acknowledge the importance of protecting existing estate residential areas, including those not serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems. The Our King 2051 Official Plan Review offers an opportunity to strengthen these protections. The Review can carefully consider additional policies that prevent the creation of smaller lots in estate residential areas, particularly where municipal servicing is not available or could undermine their existing character.</p> <p>The <u>Intensification Discussion Paper</u> identifies potential intensification areas in King City. Kingscross Estates is not identified as an area for potential intensification.</p> <p>The population forecast for King Township, as approved by the Province through the York Region Official Plan (YROP) 2022, represents the minimum growth projection for the municipality to the year 2051. The Phase 2 Growth Management Strategy Report provides a comprehensive assessment of federal immigration targets and offers an overview of planning considerations within the context of</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>driveways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The growth projections used to justify intensification are considered outdated and overly optimistic, especially given economic changes and immigration trends. - The commenter suggests reviewing growth projections to avoid unnecessary infrastructure expenses that may not be supported by actual growth. <p>Overall, the comment opposes including Kingscross Estates as an area for intensification in the new Official Plan due to environmental constraints and questions the accuracy of growth projections.</p>	<p>an evolving national and provincial economic landscape. Section 3 of the report further examines the long-term growth outlook for King Township. These demographic, economic, and immigration-related factors have already been considered in the development of the forecast and are not expected to alter the minimum population projections established for the Township.</p>
129.	Pat Rotiroti	03-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided express a resident's displeasure with the intensification plan in King Township, specifically regarding the construction of three-story townhomes on the municipal land at Kingslynn Drive and Patton Street. The resident acknowledges the township's mandate to increase intensification but emphasizes that this should not compromise the existing community fabric, which currently consists of single-family homes on spacious lots. Concerns include inconsistency with the neighborhood character and increased traffic flow that the area is not designed to handle. The resident suggests that intensification is typically more appropriate along major streets rather than within the middle of mature communities and requests reconsideration of the land use to prioritize the interests of current residents.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p> <p>To inform the finalization of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan supporting studies are underway, including a Parking and Transportation assessment and water and wastewater servicing capacity assessment. These studies will determine if updates are required to the existing infrastructure to support the proposed development, and their findings will inform the Township's Master Plans.</p>
130.	Rob Wright	04-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express strong opposition to the proposed development plans at Kingslynn and Patton. Specifically, the commenter, Rob Wright, who identifies as a landowner in King Township, opposes the building of 13 townhomes on the Memorial Park lands at Kingslynn and Patton. Additionally, there is opposition to the addition of a 4-story seniors building on top of the United Church. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on "Intensification" and "Housing" and were submitted following attendance at the King City open house.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					<p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p>
131.	Susan Wright	04-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided in the document express objection to the proposed development plans in King Township. Specifically, Susan Wright, a landowner in King Township, objects to the building of 13 townhomes on the Kingslynn and Patton Street lands and the construction of a 4-story seniors building on Elizabeth Grove. The comments are associated with the discussion papers on Intensification and Housing, and were submitted following attendance at the King City open house.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
					development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.
132.	Richard Da Pra	10-Oct-25	Comment Form	<p>The comments provided by Richard Da Pra, a resident of King Township, focus on the suitability of employment lands at 12675 Hwy 27. He highlights the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is well-suited for employment lands due to its close proximity to existing residential areas with good walkability. - The highway frontage offers easy vehicle traffic access without disrupting the residential area. - Servicing is nearby, minimizing community disruption. - Proximity to existing commercial areas can bring complementary commerce. - There is direct access to the proposed 413 Highway. - The lands would facilitate easy walking and reduce commuting times for commercial and employment purposes. <p>These comments were associated with the discussion paper on "Economic Development and Employment" and were submitted following attendance at the Nobleton open house.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the suitability of employment lands at 12675 Hwy 27.</p> <p>In February 2025 Council provided Staff with direction to pursue employment location options along 10th Concession rather than Highway 27. This was for a number of reasons, including compatibility with surrounding land uses, proximity to the Village Core and residential areas, and to reduce truck traffic through the Village. In addition, in accordance with the Provincial Planning Statement, a 300-metre buffer is generally required between employment areas and new development to mitigate and minimize potential impacts on the long-term economic viability of employment uses.</p> <p>Since Council has recently approved a residential development at 12805 Highway 27 which abuts 12675 Highway 27, there would be the potential for a land use conflict that could not address the 300-metre buffer if 12675 Hwy 27 was considered for employment uses.</p> <p>We recommend reviewing Discussion Paper 5: Planning the Village Reserve for more information on the comprehensive Concept Plan for the southwest quadrant of Nobleton.</p>
133.	Michael Colavecchia	October 1, 2025	Comment Form	<p>The comment expresses strong opposition to the proposed construction of townhomes or low-rise buildings near Memorial Park in King City. They moved to the area for its quiet, spacious, family-oriented character and feel that intensification would harm the community's identity, strain infrastructure like parks and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and concerns regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Study for the Doctors Lane Area, specifically the former Eva L. Dennis school site and the church site on Elizabeth Grove. The Township of King is committed to balancing growth with the preservation of our community's character, and recognize the importance of maintaining the unique identity of our Villages while</p>

#	Name/ Organization	Date Received	Type	Comments	Response
				<p>schools, and increase traffic on roads not designed for high volumes. They urge planners to preserve the neighborhood's integrity and direct growth to major roads rather than stable interior areas.</p>	<p>accommodating the forecast population growth and housing needs in a responsible and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The church site on Elizabeth Grove is located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area due to its proximity to the King City GO Station. Intensification is prioritized within Transit Station Areas as it supports the efficient use of public infrastructure, and promotes complete communities. Under the current Official Plan that was adopted by Council in 2019 properties in the Transit Station Area are permitted up to 6 storeys in height, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>The townhouses that are identified for the former Eva L. Dennis site at Kingslynn and Patton are identified to provide gentle density within the established neighbourhood. The site is in proximity to the parkland and the Village Core, as well as the King City GO Station, which supports walkability and complete communities. The Neighbourhood Plan is a conceptual plan that identifies a form of development that may occur in this area. Council has not endorsed the Plan or the development of townhomes in this area. We appreciate your comments and feedback and will continue to consider them as the Concept Plans are updated and finalized.</p>