

ISSUE DATE:

May 17, 2012



Ontario
Ontario Municipal Board

Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario

PL101128
PL101233
PL101237
PL101238

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended

Appellants: See Attachment "1"
Subject: Proposed Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of York
Municipality: Regional Municipality of York
OMB Case No.: PL101128
OMB File No.: PL101128

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(24) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended

Appellant: 1596630 Ontario Limited
Appellant: Dalton & Alan Faris
Appellant: Eden Mills Estates Inc.
Appellant: Martin Pick, Thomas Pick & 132463 Ontario Inc.
Appellant: Rice Commercial Group of Companies
Subject: Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 1 (ROPA 1)
Municipality: Regional Municipality of York (Town of East Gwillimbury)
OMB Case No.: PL101233
OMB File No.: PL101233

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(24) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended

Appellant: Sustainable Vaughan
Subject: Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 2 (ROPA 2)
Municipality: Regional Municipality of York (City of Vaughan)
OMB Case No.: PL101237
OMB File No.: PL101237

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(24) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. P. 13, as amended

Appellant: Minotar Holdings Inc., Cor-lots Developments, Cherokee Holdings & Halvan 5.5 Investments Limited (collectively referred to as "Minotar")
Appellant: Grace Chinese Gospel Church of North York
Appellant: North Markham Landowners Group
Subject: Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 3 (ROPA 3)
Municipality: Regional Municipality of York (Town of Markham)
OMB Case No.: PL101238
OMB File No.: PL101238

APPEARANCES:

Please refer to Attachment "2"

**DECISION OF THE BOARD AT THE 7th PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE
DELIVERED BY S. W. LEE AND K. HUSSEY**

The following matters at this pre-hearing conference (PHC) have been addressed and the Board's findings, directions and decisions are set out below:

Direction on subsequent process for bringing parts of plan into force

The Board has prescheduled a PHC for May 28 and May 29, 2012. At that PHC, a request will be made to the Board to partially approve and bring in effect parts of the York Region (Region) Official Plan-2010 (YROP). The Region seeks directions from the Board as to which stakeholders are to receive notice of the proposed modified policies and the manner of the notice.

The Board has directed notice of the modified policies in the manner of Option 1 as set out in the letter dated April 9, 2012. All appellants, non-appellant parties and participants are to be served with the Region's motion notice for partial approval in accordance with the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

There is no question that the Board has the jurisdiction to approve the modified policies on appeal. Within the context of this hearing, it is our finding that Option 1 is adequate. Mr. Kagan has suggested a more expansive notice option than that proposed by the Region. His concern is that the modifications reached amongst parties as a result of negotiations between the Region and themselves may have an effect on others not present in these proceedings.

Our decision is based, in part, on a wealth of jurisprudential precedence where notices of modified policies in a large official plan hearing are given only to the parties and participants participating at the hearing. The vessel for a growth plan conformity exercise is an official plan and the rules pertaining to notices should not be different.

Additionally, while the Board appreciates the concern expressed, we have not been given any suggestion as to what could be a better and more expedient alternative other than these options outlined by the Region. Options 2 to 4 are essentially variations of the same theme: they are options that address stakeholders that have dropped out, or those originally notified by either the adoptions of the YROP-2010 or the approvals by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH).

Furthermore, it is a truism that modifications to a plan may affect parties who have chosen not to participate in the appeal process. The functionality of notices at this juncture of the hearing is different from that at the commencement of this hearing process. The two must not be confused. Above all, the notice requirements should not be allowed to become what happened to the Red Queen in Alice's adventure, Through the Looking Glass, who has to keep running just to stand still.

Technical mapping discrepancy

A motion was brought by Worden and Montanaro Estates Limited (WM) to the Board. It is a request for an oral hearing in order to correct the land use designations. However, the motion is expansive in scope. Counsel for WM also seeks for production and discovery on a number of items from staffs of the Region and the MMAH. In addition, he seeks a change of party status. Finally, he requests for a consolidation of the YROP proceedings with the proceedings of a Richmond Hill Official Plan conformity exercise.

This motion request has triggered a focused and forceful response from both the province and the Region.

The starting point for the province is that there is no jurisdiction for the Board to change the boundary of land use designations established in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) for the WM site. Counsel for the province also insists that the Board does not possess the requisite jurisdiction to approve the OP conformity amendments with the ORMCP. These powers are vested in the minister only and not subject to appeal to the Board. The corollary of the position of the province is that the various land use designations established in the ORMCP for the WM site, which are

reflected in the in force Regional Official Plan Amendment 41 of the Region and Official Plan Amendment 218 of Richmond Hill, are beyond the Board's reach.

Counsel for the Region echoes the province's concerns with regard to the inappropriateness of the WM motion. However, they do not simply assume a defensive posture. In fact, a pre-emptive motion to forestall what might lie in store is launched. They assertively request the Board to allow the correction of the technical error. Once that relief is granted, it is the position of the counsel for the Region that the reason for WM's presence at this hearing is extinguished. The implication is that by granting the requisite relief requested by the Region, WM's continuing status will be rendered in doubt and everything requested by the WM's motion academic.

The Board has decided to hear and adjudicate this motion brought by the Region first. Our reasons are twofold. We find the simplicity and the disarming transparency of the Region's motion would more likely provide the key to the problems at hand. More importantly, we find the issues and the law raised by the Region too urgent to be subordinated, let alone being ignored.

Our findings on the Region's motion are as follows:

Firstly, it is important to appreciate the status of WM and its context in these proceedings. WM did not appeal the YROP. It is therefore not an appellant. In terms of its status at the hearing, it is quite circumscribed. Pursuant to the Board order released on July 15, 2011, it is not sheltered under any appeal of the YROP. Its party status is limited to the following discrete and defined issue:

Amendments to Maps 1, 2 and 8 of the YROP for these lands to carry forward the approved ROPA 41 land use designations for these lands.

Its participant's status is in respect of Chapter 2 of the YROP.

As to date, the Region has not reneged or relaxed its commitment to correct these errors. The Board finds it clear that once the technical mapping error is attended to satisfactorily, the reason for WM as a party or participant is spent.

Secondly, the statutory framework pertaining to this matter is highly relevant. The subject lands are wholly within the Oak Ridges Moraine and subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act (ORMCA) and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). ROPA 41, as approved by the minister was the Region's conformity amendment to the ORMCP. OPA 218 and Zoning By-law 128-04, as approved by the minister, was the Town's conformity amendments to ORMCP. Through these instruments, the ORMCP designations and the boundary delineations for the subject site were implemented to the lower tier documents. The YROP contains some mapping errors pertaining to the WM site. These errors had been recognised by the Region and the province. An undertaking had been given that they will be remedied in the course of these proceedings.

With respect to the YROP where it pertains to the subject site, the Board finds that any designations or boundary delineation cannot be anything but a carry forward of ROPA 41. In fact, it cannot be any more than that because of the following legal constraint. s.10(10) of the ORMCA provides that the minister's decision to approve an ORMCP conformity amendment such as ROPA 41 is final and not subject to appeal.

At this hearing as in any others, the Board is similarly bound by s.10 (10) of ORMCA in the sense that it cannot do indirectly what it cannot do directly. The correction of the errors cannot be utilized as a pretext or an opportunity for the Board to modify, enlarge or tinker with any of the components approved by the minister through ROPA 41. The Board cannot act beyond its mandate. In fact, it is obligated to vouchsafe the technical mapping amendment must progress in a way that is within the legal bounds.

Thirdly, we find the nature of the proceeding may be altered if what are requested in WM's motion were given effect. Both the province and the Region are correct in its respective expressions of apprehensions and misgivings. The motion launched by WM does create opportunities to reopen the in-force ORMCP designations as implemented through ROPA 41 and OPA 218. A prospect of an oral hearing, together with a plethora of discovery and disclosure measures, a party status change and a consolidation of hearing events can give rise to the vicissitude of the proceedings straying into areas other than technical corrections. In short, if one were less vigilant, a technical mapping

discrepancy exercise can easily mutate into a full-blown, re-determination of land use designations and boundaries. That would also be contrary to the law.

Finally, the Board has a duty in a proceeding of this size and complexity to instill and enforce a sense of proportionality. A technical mapping amendment is not, and should not be, such a daunting task that a full dressed hearing will be required.

Accordingly, the Board will allow the motion of the Region. The Board finds that the technical mapping discrepancy can be appropriately corrected through filing with the Board the modifications to Maps 1, 2 & 3. Upon the filing of these proposed modifications and upon the Board being satisfied that it is an authentic carry-forward of ROPA 41, the requisite modification order can be issued.

In view of this finding, the motion of WM needs not be heard.

Notice of motion by King City pursuant to s.17(44.1) and 17(44.2)

The Board has adjourned the hearing of this motion to the May 28 to 29 dates. The Board also directs the Region to serve King City the relevant modified policies on King City. The Region should do so as soon as the final versions of the modified policies are available. If the motion hearing can be settled as a result of the serving of the modified polices and discussions between the Region and King City, the Board would like to be advised.

Other miscellaneous matters

Ms. Foran has requested the Board to entertain the notion of setting hearing dates at the May 28 session. The Board will be prepared to hear the positions of the parties at these sessions. However, the Board will set dates if we are satisfied that a state of readiness for hearings exists.

At these sessions, the Board would appreciate a road map from the major parties, as to the planned phasing of the hearings: why they are so configured, how they fit with the current and ongoing mediation sessions, the general contour of the issues, and how

best the Board can further case-manage? The Board will appreciate a detailed explanation as to why and how one phase should precede and dovetail the other, the duration of each phase and the stakeholders in these sessions, and the likelihood and realism of settlements or shrinkage through mediations. The Board wishes to remind parties about the ongoing growth plan scheduled hearings and the implications for counsel and consultants, some of whom have ubiquitous presence at these events. Last, but not the least, the Board's own resources and calendar constraints are a factor in this equation.

The Board has scheduled a further two-day prehearing conference to commence on **Monday, May 28, 2012, at 10:30 a.m. to be held at the Sheraton Parkway Toronto North Hotel, Suites and Conference Centre, 600 Highway 7 East, in Richmond Hill.**

Mr. Waque has indicated that he is requesting another PHC for the month of June. The Board is also prepared to entertain his request. The Board is desirous of knowing the agenda in advance.

"S. W. Lee"

S. W. LEE
ASSOCIATE CHAIR

"K. Hussey"

K. HUSSEY
VICE-CHAIR

ATTACHMENT "1"

List of Appellants

1. Angus Glen North West Inc. and Angus Glen Holdings Inc.
2. E. Manson Investments
3. North Leslie Residential Landowners Group Inc.
4. North Markham Landowners Group
 - 1212763 Ontario Limited
 - 1463069 Ontario Limited
 - 1512406 Ontario Limited
 - 1612286 Ontario Inc.
 - 4551 Elgin Mills Developments Limited
 - CAVCOE Holding Ltd.
 - Colebay Investments Inc.
 - First Elgin Mills Developments Inc.
 - Firwood Holdings Inc.
 - Glendower Properties Inc.
 - Highcove Investments Inc.
 - Mackenzie 48 Investments Limited
 - Kennedy Elgin Developments Limited
 - Major Kennedy Developments Limited
 - Major Kennedy South Developments Limited
 - Major McCowan Developments Limited
 - Romandale Farms Limited; Frambordeaux Developments Inc.
 - Summerlane Realty Corp.
 - Tsialtas, Peter and Cathy
 - Tung Kee Investment Limited Partnership
 - Warden Mills Developments Limited
 - ZACORP Ventures Inc.
5. Loblaw Properties Limited
6. Rice Commercial Group of Companies
7. Yonge Green Lane Developments Limited
8. Mr. Allen Eng
9. Mr. John Hayes
10. Mr. Paul Jadilebovski
11. Mr. Peter Antonopoulos
12. Mr. Philip Comartin
13. Mr. Shai Perlmutter
14. Mr. Steven DeFreitas
15. Peat Farmers of Ontario represented by Mr. Phil Comartin

16. Property Owners with Rights Association represented by Paul Jadilebovski
17. Kau & Associates L.P.
18. Block 27 Landowners Group
19. Dorzil Developments (Bayview) Ltd.
20. Westlin Farms
21. Lucia Milani and Rizmi Holdings Limited
22. Daraban Holdings Limited
23. Smart Centres and Calloway Real Estate Investment Trust
24. Yonge Bayview Holdings Inc.
25. 583753 Ontario Ltd.
26. 775377 Ontario Ltd.
27. Helmhorst Investments Ltd.
28. Aurora 2C Landowners Group Inc.
29. W. J. Smith Gardens Limited
30. Metrus Development Inc.
31. Upper City Corporation and Clear Point Developments
32. Minotar Holdings Inc, Cor-lots Development, Cherokee Holdings and Halvan 5.5 Investments Limited
33. Dalton and Alan Faris and Eden Mills Estates Inc.
34. Robert G. Sikura
35. Aurora-Leslie Developments Inc.
36. Fieldgate Developments and TACC Developments
37. Times Group Corporation
38. Memorial Gardens Canada Limited
40. 583753 Ontario Ltd.
41. Amir Hessam Limited and 668152 Ontario Ltd.
42. Arten Developments Inc.
43. Sanmike Construction Ltd.
44. Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation
46. Mahamevna Bhavana Asapuwa Toronto
47. The Mandarin Golf and Country Club Inc. and AV Investments II Inc.
48. Cornerstone Christian Community Church
49. Tesmar Holdings Inc.
50. Sustainable Vaughan
51. Markham Gateway Inc.

ATTACHMENT 2

List of Parties and Participants (as updated July 20, 2011)

Public Sector Party Status

Note: Underlined text denotes text updated on July 20, 2011

~~Strikethrough~~ text denotes either a withdrawal of appeal or an OMB Order deeming not to be an appellant, updated as of April 11, 2012

Municipality or other public agency	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status
Township of King	J. Matera	PL101128	Party
Town of Markham	C. Conrad	PL101128 PL101233 PL101237 PL101238	Party
City of Vaughan	C. Storto	PL101128 PL101233 PL101237 PL101238	Party
Town of East Gwillimbury	Don Sinclair	PL101128 PL101233 <u>PL101237</u> PL101238	Party
Town of Richmond Hill	Antonio R. Dimilla	PL101128 PL101233 PL101237 PL101238	Party

PL101128
PL101233
PL101237
PL101238

Public Sector Participant Status

Municipality or other public agency	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status
Town of Newmarket	E. Armchuck-Ball	PL101128 PL101233	Participant
Town of Georgina	S. Leisk	PL101233	Participant
TRCA		PL101128 PL101233 PL101237 PL101238	Participant

Landowner Party Status

Landowner	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status	Appeal to Which Status Granted (See Attachment A)	Policies to Which Status Relates
Angus Glen Developments Ltd. Angus Glen Golf Club Ltd.	S. Leisk	PL101238 (ROPA 3)	Party	ROPA 3 – North Markham Landowners Group	ROPA 3 - Policies and mapping raised by North Markham Landowners Group appeal respecting the urban boundary expansion as delineated by ROPA 3 and the alternative urban boundary line
Haulover Investments Ltd.	J. Streisfield	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	PL101128 – 1, 2, 18, 19, 23, 28, 36, 37	5.2.20 and 5.2.21, 3.5.7, 7.2.31, 7.2.32, 7.2.52, 7.5.3, 7.5.4
William H. Worden and Yvonne W. Worden Montanaro Estates Limited	J. Streisfield	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	N/A	Amendments to Maps 1, 2 and 8 of ROP - 2010 for the Worden/Montanaro lands to carry forward the approved ROPA 41 land use designations for those lands.
Vaughan 400 Landowners Group Inc.	M. Melling	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	N/A	Lifting of deferral area 2 in ROPA 52

Landowner Party Status

Landowner	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status	Appeal to Which Status Granted (See Attachment A)	Policies to Which Status Relates
Harry John Lewis and Murray Allin Lewis	D. Hindson	PL101128 (ROP) PL101238 (ROPA 3)	Party	PL101128 - 47 ROPA 3	Chapter 2 policies and related maps, figures and definitions, as set out in Mr. Hindson's letter of May 4, 2011 ROPA 3 - Map 2
Donald Miller					
Ruth Elizabeth Brock	D. Hindson	PL101238 (ROPA 3)	Party	ROPA 3 - North Markham Landowners Group	ROPA 3 - Policies and mapping raised by North Markham Landowners Group appeal respecting the urban boundary expansion as delineated by ROPA 3 and the alternative urban boundary line
Lois Marguerite Frisby					
Ruth Elizabeth Brock					
Charlotte Marie Frisby					
Marguerite Alice Gallone					
Gerhard Schickendanz					
Elma Schickendanz					
Wagama Holdings Limited					
Lorna Mary Passafiume					
Walmark Holdings Inc.					
MI Developments Inc.	S. Zakem	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	PL101128 - 49	Policies which may be raised by Tesmar appeal
Delisle Properties Limited	B. Horosko	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	PL101128 - 49	Policies which may be raised by Tesmar appeal
Block 34 East Landowners Group Inc.	R. Houser	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	N/A	Lifting of deferral area 1 in ROPA 52

Landowner Party Status

Landowner	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status	Appeal to Which Status Granted (See Attachment A)	Policies to Which Status Relates
Dorzil Developments (Bayview) Ltd.	J. Alati	PL101233 (ROPA 1)	Party	PL101233 (ROPA 1)	ROPA 1
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation ("CMHC") and Quaestus Corporation	P. Devine M. Piel	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	PL101128 - 23 and 37	Policy identified as "old 4.3.8" on Exhibit 4
Halvan 5.5 Investments Limited	C. Lyons	PL101128 (ROP)	Party	PL101128 - 32	Policies at issue in Minotaur et. al appeals
<u>Kau and Associates</u>	<u>B. Horosko</u> <u>C. Facciolo</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>PL101128 - 5, 6, 23, and 37</u>	<u>4.3.3; 4.3.4; 4.3.7; 4.3.9; 4.3.12; 4.4.6; definition of "Major Retail"</u>
<u>Mahamevna Bhavana Asapuwa Toronto</u>	<u>M. Flowers</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>PL101128 - 47</u>	<u>6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.10 and Map 8</u>
<u>Block 27 Landowners Group Inc.</u>	<u>M. Melling</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u> <u>PL101237 (ROPA 2)</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>PL101128 - 4, 19, 30</u> <u>PL101237 (ROPA 2)</u>	<u>Appeals and policies as set out in correspondence between D. Klacko and M. Melling on June 13 and 14, 2011 and July 8 and 18, 2011 (filed as Exhibit 23)</u>
<u>Huron-Wendat Nation</u>	<u>D. Donnelly</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>PL101128 - 4, 27</u>	<u>3.4.11 and 3.4.14</u>

Landowner Participant Status

Landowner	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status	Appeal to Which Status Granted (See Attachment A)	Policies to Which Status Relates
Trevor Rose Angelo Antonangeli, Leslie Gardens 1450968 Ontario Inc, c/o Peter Gorin	H. Friedman	PL101128 (ROP)	Participant	PL101128	Participant status sought to monitor 2.2.19, 2.2.31, 2.2.34, 2.2.35, Map 8,6.3.7(d), 8.3.3. and definition of "Agricultural Uses"
Intracorp Projects Acquisitions Ltd.	M. Melling	PL101128 (ROP)	Participant	PL101128	Participant status sought to monitor and protect interests respecting designation, mapping and policies applicable to subject lands in Richmond Hill as identified in May 9, 2011 email from Mr. Melling.
South Sharon Developments Inc.	J. Park	PL101128 (ROP) PL101233 (ROPA 1)	Participant	PL101128 ROPA 1	Participant status sought to monitor proceedings to ensure no amendments that would impact subject lands set out in May 9, 2011 letter.
William H. Worden and Yvonne W. Worden Montanaro Estates Limited	J. Streisfield	PL101128 (ROP)	Participant	PL101128	Participant status with respect to Chapter 2 of ROP.

PL101128
PL101233
PL101237
PL101238

Landowner Participant Status

Landowner	Counsel	OMB proceeding in which status is granted	Status	Appeal to Which Status Granted (See Attachment A)	Policies to Which Status Relates
<u>Markham Gateway Inc.</u>	<u>R. Beaman</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u>	<u>Participant</u>	<u>PL101128</u>	
<u>165 Pine Grove Investments Inc.</u>	<u>A. Brown</u>	<u>PL101128 (ROP)</u> <u>PL101237 (ROPA 2)</u>	<u>Participant</u>	<u>PL101128</u> <u>PL101237</u>	Participant status to monitor policies 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 and ROPA 2.

ATTACHMENT "A"

List of Appellants

York Region Official Plan – OMB Case No. PL101128

1. Angus Glen North West Inc. and Angus Glen Holdings Inc.
2. E. Manson Investments
3. North Leslie Residential Landowners Group Inc.
4. North Markham Landowners Group
 - 1212763 Ontario Limited
 - 1463069 Ontario Limited
 - 1512406 Ontario Limited
 - 1612286 Ontario Inc.
 - 4551 Elgin Mills Developments Limited
 - CAVCOE Holding Ltd.
 - Colebay Investments Inc.
 - First Elgin Mills Developments Inc.
 - Firwood Holdings Inc.
 - Glendower Properties Inc.
 - Highcove Investments Inc.
 - Kennedy Elgin Developments Limited
 - Mackenzie 48 Investments Limited
 - Major Kennedy Developments Limited
 - Major Kennedy South Developments Limited
 - Major McCowan Developments Limited
 - Romandale Farms Limited; Frambordeaux Developments Inc.
 - Summerlane Realty Corp.
 - Tsialtas, Peter and Cathy
 - Tung Kee Investment Limited Partnership
 - Warden Mills Developments Limited
 - ZACORP Ventures Inc.

5. Loblaw Properties Limited
6. Rice Commercial Group of Companies
7. Yonge Green Lane Developments Limited
8. ~~Mr. Allen Eng~~
9. ~~Mr. John Hayes~~
10. ~~Mr. Paul Jadilebovski~~
11. ~~Mr. Peter Antonopoulos~~
12. ~~Mr. Philip Comartin~~
13. ~~Mr. Shai Perlmutter~~
14. ~~Mr. Steven DeFreitas~~
15. ~~Peat Farmers of Ontario represented by Mr. Phil Comartin~~
16. ~~Property Owners with Rights Association represented by Paul Jadilebovski~~
17. ~~Kau & Associates L.P.~~
18. ~~Block 27 Landowners Group~~
19. Dorzil Developments (Bayview) Ltd.
20. Westlin Farms
21. Lucia Milani and Rizmi Holdings Limited
22. Daraban Holdings Limited
23. Smart Centres and Calloway Real Estate Investment Trust
24. Yonge Bayview Holdings Inc.
25. 583753 Ontario Ltd.
26. 775377 Ontario Ltd.
27. Helmhorst Investments Ltd.
28. Aurora 2C Landowners Group Inc.
29. W. J. Smith Gardens Limited
30. Metrus Development Inc.
31. Upper City Corporation and Clear Point Developments
32. Minotar Holdings Inc, Cor-lots Development, Cherokee Holdings and ~~Halvan 5.5 Investments Limited~~
33. Dalton and Alan Faris and Eden Mills Estates Inc.
34. Robert G. Sikura
35. Aurora-Leslie Developments Inc.
36. Fieldgate Developments and ~~TACC Developments~~
37. Times Group Corporation
38. Memorial Gardens Canada Limited
40. 583753 Ontario Ltd.
41. Amir Hessam Limited and 668152 Ontario Ltd.

42. ~~Arten Developments Inc.~~
43. ~~Sanmike Construction Ltd.~~
44. ~~Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation~~
46. ~~Mahamevna Bhavana Asapuwa Toronto~~
47. ~~The Mandarin Golf and Country Club Inc. and AV Investments II Inc.~~
48. ~~Cornerstone Christian Community Church~~
49. ~~Tesmar Holdings Inc.~~
50. ~~Sustainable Vaughan~~
51. ~~Markham Gateway Inc.~~

Amendment 1 – Urban Expansion in the Town of East Gwillimbury – OMB Case No. PL101233

- Dalton and Alan Faris
- Eden Mills Estates Inc.
- Martin Pick, Thomas Pick and 132463 Ontario Inc.
- Rice Commercial Group of Companies

Amendment 2 – Urban Expansion in the City of Vaughan – OMB Case No. PL101237

- Sustainable Vaughan

Amendment 3 - Urban Expansion in the Town of Markham – OMB Case No. PL101238

- Minotar Holdings Inc., Corlots Developments, Cherokee Holdings and Halvan 5.5 Investments Ltd.
- Grace Chinese Gospel Church of North York
- North Markham Landowners Group
 - 1212763 Ontario Limited
 - 1463069 Ontario Limited
 - 1512406 Ontario Limited
 - 1612286 Ontario Inc.
 - 4551 Elgin Mills Developments Limited
 - CAVCOE Holding Ltd.
 - Colebay Investments Inc.
 - First Elgin Mills Developments Inc.
 - Firwood Holdings Inc.
 - Glendower Properties Inc.
 - Highcove Investments Inc.
 - Kennedy Elgin Developments Limited
 - Mackenzie 48 Investments Limited
 - Major Kennedy Developments Limited
 - Major Kennedy South Developments Limited
 - Major McCowan Developments Limited
 - Romandale Farms Limited; Frambordeaux Developments Inc.
 - Summerlane Realty Corp
 - Tsialtas, Peter and Cathy
 - Tung Kee Investment Limited Partnership
 - Warden Mills Developments Limited
 - ZACORP Ventures Inc.