



## **Council Public Meeting**

### **Minutes**

**C#14-19**

**Wednesday, April 3, 2019, 7:30 p.m.**

**Council Chambers**

**225 East Beaver Creek Road**

**Richmond Hill, Ontario**

Council Members Present: Mayor Barrow  
Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli  
Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola  
Councillor Muench  
Councillor Liu  
Councillor West  
Councillor Cilevitz

Regrets: Councillor Beros  
Councillor Chan

Staff Members Present:

G. Galanis, Director, Development Planning  
P. Lee, Director, Policy Planning  
D. Beaulieu, Manager, Development - Subdivisions  
S. von Kursell, Manager, Planning Policy  
P. Liu, Planner I  
M. Makrigiorgos, Regional and Local Councillor Chief of Staff  
R. Pham-Nguyen, Administrative Assistant to Members of Council  
J. Hambleton, Administrative Assistant to Members of Council  
J. Hypolite, IT Service Desk Technical Analyst  
G. Collier, Deputy Town Clerk  
S. Dumont, Council/Committee Coordinator

Mayor Barrow read the Public Hearing Statement

### **1. Adoption of Agenda**

Moved by: Councillor Cilevitz  
Seconded by: Councillor West

That the agenda be adopted as distributed by the Clerk with the following additions:

1. Correspondence from JP Morson, 12 Innis Crescent, dated March 24, 2019
2. Correspondence from Jeffrey E. Streisfield, Landlaw, dated March 28, 2019
3. Correspondence from Michael A. Gray, on behalf of Malin Direct Corp., dated March 29, 2019
4. Correspondence from Todd Trudelle, Goldberg Group, on behalf of Upper Yonge Properties Limited, dated April 1, 2019
5. Correspondence from Mary Amato, 10077 Yonge Street, dated April 2, 2019
6. Correspondence from Isaac Tang, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP, on behalf of Laurier Homes (Richmond Hill) Inc., dated April 2, 2019
7. Correspondence from Don and Wendy Thomson, 53 Arnold Crescent, dated April 2, 2019
8. Correspondence from Wilhelm Bleek, 136 Centre Street West, dated April 2, 2019
9. Correspondence from James Ravenscroft, on behalf of Richmond Hill United Church, dated April 2, 2019

Carried

## 2. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest by members of Council under the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

## 3. **Scheduled Business:**

### 3.1 **SRPRS.19.060 - Request for Comments – Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications – King East Developments 19 Inc. and King East Developments 21 Inc. – 19 and 21 Poplar Drive - File Number D02-18025 and D03-18012**

Philip Liu of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications to permit a residential development comprised of ten single detached dwellings and a new public road on the subject lands. Mr. Liu advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Murray Evans, Evans Planning Inc., agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the applications and identified that the proposed new road will connect to Poplar Drive and align itself opposite Vitlor Drive. He noted that

the connection was anticipated for decades as a sight triangle was taken off an adjacent property when it was severed years ago. Mr. Evans advised that 50-foot lots front Poplar Drive and 40-foot lots are within the interior, which he noted was consistent with the tradition of infill development with respect to maintaining the frontages on existing roads and allowing slightly smaller lots within the interior. Mr. Evans provided a graphic to highlight the location of the proposed development, noting that the development is one of the last parcels within the block. He also provided an overview of the development status of the surrounding lands.

There were no members of the public who responded to the Chair's invitation to address Council on this matter.

Moved by: Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola  
 Seconded by: Councillor West

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.19.060 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications submitted by King East Developments 19 Inc. and King East Developments 21 Inc. for lands known as Lot 42 and Part of Lots 40 and 41, Plan 202 (Municipal Addresses: 19 and 21 Poplar Drive), Town Files D02-18025 and D03-18012, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

### **3.2 SRPRS.19.061 - Request for Comments – Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications – King East Developments 428 Inc. – 428 King Road - File Number D02-18026 and D03-18013**

Philip Liu of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications to permit five single detached dwellings and six townhouse dwellings, in addition to the creation of a new public road on the subject lands. Mr. Liu advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Murray Evans, Evans Planning Inc., agent for the applicant, displayed an illustration of the subdivision and noted that the proposed development was strategic in that it links phase 1 and phase 2 of the approved plan. He advised that the townhouses will face King Road which is consistent with the theme and land uses that have already been approved by Council.

There were no members of the public who responded to the Chair's invitation to address Council on this matter.

Moved by: Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola

Seconded by: Councillor West

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.19.061 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications submitted by King East Developments 428 Inc., for lands known as Lot 57, Plan M-807 (Municipal Address: 428 King Road), Town Files D02-18026 and D03-18013, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

### **3.3 SRPRS.19.054 - Proposed Repeal of By-law 23-17 Adopting Amendment No. 6 to the Richmond Hill Official Plan (the Downtown Local Centre Secondary Plan)**

Sybelle von Kursell of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed repeal of By-law 23-17 that adopted Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 6 (the Downtown Local Centre Secondary Plan) into the Official Plan. She advised of the effect of repealing the Secondary Plan and outlined the next steps of the new planning process. Ms. von Kursell advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Wilhelm Bleek, 136 Centre Street West, shared his belief that 'reconsideration' can be said as an alternative to 'repeal' of the Downtown Local Centre (DLC) Secondary Plan. Mr. Bleek outlined four principles he believed needed to be balanced in the vision of the plan as further detailed in his submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.3.8. They included respect for the historic foundations of the Town, help the growing population of the Town recognize a sense of identity, a public gathering place, and incentives for the landowners to develop their properties in an economically profitable way.

David Crowley, 48 Greenbelt Crescent, advised of his concerns related to transportation and recognized that Provincial policy mandates increases in density to accommodate population and employment. He also shared his belief that there are limitations to what can be accommodated in the village section of the Town, and that the current DLC Secondary Plan did not recognize that limitation. He concluded by noting that he will be

following the review of the DLC Secondary Plan to ensure that the realities of the role of transit are recognized.

Mary Amato, 10070 Yonge Street, shared her belief that the DLC Secondary Plan's vision with respect to "linked system of courtyards and mews" was unrealistic. She outlined concerns with the courtyard and mews, which included safety, snow storage, parking, lighting, maintenance and liability as further detailed in her submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.3.5.

Agnes Parr, 125 Hall Street, expressed her opposition to the repeal of the DLC Secondary Plan, noting that the purpose of the plan was to protect the historical nature of the downtown core. She advised of her disappointment that taxpayers' dollars were spent, including many hours committed by residents and business owners to make the plan a reality. She expressed her belief that density and height are not needed to achieve revitalization, and that both factors could have an adverse effect on attracting people to the area. She advised that that the downtown core with its surrounding neighborhoods and historic features is warm and inviting, as well as the centre for much of Richmond Hill's history. She also highlighted the contributions of families who have lived, owned businesses and attended churches in the downtown core.

Anna Dalla Rosa, 29 Cygnus Drive, shared her concern for the historic downtown core, noting that people live best and most productively when they have a sense of place, belonging, continuity, home, and when they can play an authentic part in the decisions that they have to live with. She advised that what was needed was good modern planning, with all stakeholders working together for the community. Ms. Rosa noted that the historical character of the core needs to be preserved and restored carefully, as other towns and cities have done, in order to attract people to the area. She shared her belief that there are other places to intensify, and that if we destroy, add height, build close to the road, and build predominately-new buildings, the area will resemble a strip mall.

Juliusz Zulauf, 125 Hall Street, advised that it was the look, feel, and character of Richmond Hill's downtown core that was a factor in his decision to move to Richmond Hill. He advised that the DLC Secondary Plan needs to preserve what needs to be preserved while promoting balanced growth, and that an effort has to be made to satisfy the majority of citizens. He appealed to Council to consider consultations, public opinion and revising the existing plan to make the necessary

improvements. He also shared his belief that repealing the plan would leave a void, and a lack of vision that could possibly lead to development that is inconsistent with the character of the existing neighbourhood.

Michael Gray, spoke on behalf of Malin Direct Corp. in support of the repeal of the DLC Secondary Plan, as further detailed in his submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.3.3. He noted their support for a new Secondary Plan, including any amendments to Part 1 of the Official Plan, as well as any accompanying zoning by-law to permit an appropriate increase in height and density for buildings within their property. Mr. Gray noted that development of his client's property would contribute to the economic revitalization of the area, and help achieve the intensification along Yonge Street as envisioned by Richmond Hill and York's Region's Official Plan.

George Teichman, President of Upper Yonge Properties Limited, 10441 to 10459 Yonge Street, shared his support for the repeal of the DLC Secondary Plan as outlined in correspondence from his consultant distributed as Correspondence Item 3.3.4. Mr. Teichman advised that he would participate fully in a new Secondary Plan process and requested that he be notified of all future staff reports and meetings.

A representative speaking on behalf of the owners of 10366 Yonge Street, advised that the DLC Secondary Plan envisioned a compact, mixed-use pedestrian-oriented area. He noted that in his opinion the cap on density and height in the plan does not represent intensification and not aligned with the vision and intent of the plan. He shared his belief that the downtown of a city is a representation of its prosperity, and that tall buildings and density are characteristics of what makes cities look prosperous. He advised that what was needed was an adequate number of residential units to accommodate the population and future growth, as well as business and commercial plazas. He shared his belief that the DLC Secondary Plan should be repealed, and that with proper planning, development and preservation of historical characteristics of the Town can be accommodated.

Mahdi Foomani, property owner of 10027 Yonge Street, shared his belief that the DLC Secondary Plan failed to meet its objectives of protecting heritage buildings, and promoting the development and revitalization of the downtown core. He elaborated by stating that there has been no newly designated heritage buildings and no development within the last ten years. He advised that the same failure could occur if the failed policies

and by-laws that have been in place are not corrected. Mr. Foomani recommended that Council consult with property owners, and applicants to obtain information that would improve the new DLC Secondary Plan.

Brian Chapnik, 110 Arnold Crescent, advised that he felt there was a lack of transparency, as the reasons for the repeal of the DLC Secondary Plan have not been communicated to the residents. He shared his belief that without a Secondary Plan in place development that goes forward in the next few years will not have the benefit of a visionary document to provide guidance. Mr. Chapnik advised that he hopes the new Secondary Plan will also emphasize historical preservation, and that staff are given direction to consider the historical character of the area when considering applications received in the absence of a plan.

Moved by: Councillor Muench

Seconded by: Councillor West

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.19.054 be received for information and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

#### **4. Adjournment**

Moved by: Councillor Cilevitz

Seconded by: Councillor West

That the meeting be adjourned

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

---

Dave Barrow  
Mayor

---

Gloria Collier  
Deputy City Clerk