



Council Public Meeting

Minutes

C#02-20

Wednesday, January 22, 2020, 7:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

225 East Beaver Creek Road

Richmond Hill, Ontario

Council Members Present: Mayor Barrow
Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli
Councillor Beros
Councillor Muench
Councillor West
Councillor Cilevitz
Councillor Chan

Regrets: Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola
Councillor Liu

Staff Members Present:

K. Kwan, Commissioner, Planning and Regulatory Services
D. Terzievski, Director, Development Engineering and Transportation
D. Beaulieu, Manager, Development Subdivisions
S. Mowder, Planner I – Subdivisions
S. Fiore, Planner II – Development
K. Graham – Senior Planner - Development
M. Makrigiorgos, Regional and Local Councillor Chief of Staff
R. Pham-Nguyen, Constituency Assistant to the Regional and Local Councillor
J. Hypolite, IT Service Desk Technical Analyst
S. Huycke, City Clerk
S. Dumont, Council/Committee Coordinator

Mayor Barrow read the Public Hearing Statement.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Chan
Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

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

1. Correspondence from Cila Alam, 9 Cooperage Crescent, dated January 14, 2020
2. Correspondence from John and Anna Iadipaolo, 7 Cooperage Crescent, dated January 15, 2020
3. Correspondence from Alina Margulis, 7 Shaftsbury Avenue, dated January 22, 2020
4. Correspondence from Moira Tasker, 72 Naughton Drive, dated November 15, 2019
5. Correspondence from Marcia Cannell, 44 Neighbourly Lane, dated November 17, 2019
6. Correspondence from Leslie Turner, 17 Firwood Drive, dated November 17, 2019
7. Correspondence from Doris and Emil Hahn, 86 Ritva Court, dated November 17, 2019
8. Correspondence from Michael Zahra, 11 Canyon Hill Avenue, dated November 25, 2019
9. Correspondence from Patricia Colavita, 41 Chantilly Crescent, dated January 14, 2020
10. Correspondence from Daniel Porchak, 149 Cooperage Crescent, dated January 14, 2020
11. Correspondence from Michel, resident of Canyon Hill Avenue, dated January 17, 2020
12. Correspondence from Justin Chen, 2 Dubonair Street, dated January 21, 2020
13. Correspondence from Michel Iskander, 177 Canyon Hill Avenue, dated January 21, 2020

14. Correspondence from Heba Shehata, 177 Canyon Hill Avenue, dated January 21, 2020
15. Correspondence from Nadia Popovici, 20 Royal Chapin Crescent, dated January 22, 2020
16. Correspondence from Julia Orechvikova, 197 Rothbury Road, dated January 22, 2020
17. Correspondence from Nicole Rubacha, 21 Dunvegan Drive, dated January 22, 2020

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.20.006 – Request for Comments – Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Feridoon and Shirin Ravadgar – 292 Elgin Mills Road West - City File Number D02-19018

Sarah Mowder of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit a medium density residential development comprised of four semi-detached and five townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands.

Johnathan Benczkowski, Sol-Arch, agent for the applicant, advised of the purpose of the zoning by-law amendment. He noted that it was a built form that was becoming more prevalent along Elgin Mills Road and that a similar development was approved to the east approaching Yonge Street. Mr. Benczkowski also shared his belief that the Region's vision was to intensify the area, as road widening was planned for Elgin Mills Road and the Official Plan polices permitted medium density residential development.

Bruce Rhodes, 3 Tollbar Court, shared his concerns regarding traffic in the area, and access and egress to and from the development.

John Iadipaolo, 7 Cooperage Crescent, advised of his opposition to the proposed development, as further detailed in his submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.1.2. He shared his belief that it would diminish the

character of the surrounding neighbourhood, lower property values and negatively affect green space, noise levels and privacy.

Cila Alam, 9 Cooperage Crescent, expressed concerns with privacy, safety, noise, and the affect the proposed development could have on the property value of her home, as further detailed in her submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.1.1.

Muzi Liu, 5 Shaftsbury Avenue, shared her belief that the proposed development did not align with the community's values, and that it would negatively affect the character of the neighbourhood.

Moved by: Councillor West

Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.20.006 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Feridoon and Shirin Ravadgar for the lands known as Part of Lot 14, Plan 2404 (Municipal Address: 292 Elgin Mills Road West), City File D02-19018, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

3.2 SRPRS.20.007 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - 2575563 Ontario Inc. - 152, 160, 166, 172 and 178 Major Mackenzie Drive East and 123 Ruggles Avenue - City File Number D02-19017

Simone Fiore of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit a medium density residential development comprised of 35 back-to-back townhouse dwelling units on the subject lands.

Todd Trudell, Goldberg Group, agent for the applicant, outlined the details of the development proposal. He shared his belief that the property was well suited for intensification due to it's proximity to the GO Station and Bus Rapid Transit. Mr. Trudell also advised that he will continue to work with staff to address comments received.

Wayne McKibbon, 114 Ruggles Avenue, shared concerns regarding the lack of parking proposed for each dwelling and the loss of mature trees. He also expressed concerns regarding pedestrian safety along sidewalks on Major Mackenzie Drive.

Muzi Liu, 5 Shaftsbury Avenue, expressed concern for the youth and new immigrants due to the lack of housing affordability. She also shared her belief that the Provincial Growth Plan did not address the housing affordability issue.

Moved by: Councillor Muench

Seconded by: Councillor West

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.20.007 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by 2575563 Ontario Inc. for the lands known as Lots 59 and 86, and Part of Lots 57, 58, 87 and 88, Plan 1883 (Municipal Addresses: 152, 160, 166, 172 and 178 Major Mackenzie Drive East and 123 Ruggles Avenue), City File D02-19017, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.3 SRPRS.20.002 – Request for Comments – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – Dogliola Developments Ltd. and Campo Ridge Home Corp. – 10898, 10922, 10944 and 10956 Yonge Street - City File Numbers D01-19003 and D02-19016

Kaitlyn Graham of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department provided an overview of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit the construction of a high density, mixed-use residential/commercial development on the subject lands.

Lincoln Lo, Malone Given Parsons Ltd, agent for the applicant, provided an overview of the development proposal, noting that the development concept across the entire land holdings proposed lower density units to the west and higher density frontage along Yonge Street. He advised that a density amendment would not be required, as the Floor Space Index across the entire land holdings met the minimum requirement for a Key Development Area (KDA). Mr. Lo provided an illustration of Richmond Hill's intensification hierarchy, and identified similar approved developments within the KDA designation. He shared his belief that the height limit permitted within the Yonge and Bernard KDA did not differentiate the KDA from other growth areas, as it should. He also noted that the Official Plan was dated, and that many changes have occurred to provincial policy and investment.

Mike, 157 Canyon Hill Avenue, advised of concerns pertaining to the lack of compatibility of the proposed development with the existing

neighbourhood. He shared concerns regarding the lack of transition in height and the absence of the required 45 degree angular view plane. He also noted concerns with the BRT system, overshadowing, noise, traffic, and the lack of infrastructure to support the intensification in the area.

Matthew Piazza, 107 Leyburn Avenue, shared concerns regarding the proposed density and pace of development, and the lack of infrastructure to support the intensification.

Sherry Zhang, 234 Rothbury Road, advised of concerns with the precedent that would be set if increased heights and density were permitted. She shared her belief that intensification had to be realistic and in an appropriate location, and asked that Council not use the Province's intensification targets as justification to approve ambiguous development proposals.

John Li, 206 Brookside Road, shared what he believed were misconceptions used to justify overdevelopment. He provided data to illustrate that Richmond Hill was on track to meet intensification targets, and that the City had significant land to support future development. Mr. Li shared his belief that a future subway station in the City should not be used to justify development as studies indicated public transit usage was on the decline.

Lisa Bastianan, 320 Canyon Hill Avenue, shared her opinion that development within the Yonge and Bernard KDA was not equally comparable to the development within the Yonge and 16th KDA, as the proposed development was nearly double the permitted density. She shared concerns regarding traffic, safety, snow removal and lack of services to support the intensification.

Jing Sung, 10 Stancroft Drive, shared his opposition to the project and questioned the BRT system's ability to relieve traffic congestion, noting his belief that traffic would become worse as construction continues on Yonge Street.

Wei Hua, 14 Tentone Court, shared concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure to accommodate the proposed density and asked that measured steps be taken to develop. He expressed concerns regarding traffic, and shared his belief that people will still rely on their vehicles regardless of their proximity to the BRT.

Debbie Mida, 198 Canyon Hill Avenue, shared her belief that development within the Yonge and Bernard KDA alone may assist Richmond Hill in

meeting its intensification targets. She shared concerns regarding the lack of parkland within the KDA, and noted that recent statistics showed that collisions within the KDA were considerably higher than the Richmond Hill average. Ms. Mida also advised of concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Jeffrey Marder, 6 Desert View Crescent, inquired whether there were plans to develop a property located on the east side of Yonge Street, north of Levendale Road and suggested that it could be developed with little impact to neighboring residents.

Scott Thompson, 104 Baker Avenue, shared concerns with the proposed density, pace of development, and the ability of the City to provide services to accommodate the growth. He also shared his belief that the City needed to take measured steps to grow, as it had been under the Yonge and Bernard Secondary Plan before it was appealed.

Bruce Rhodes, 3 Tollbar Court, questioned if there was any significance of high aquifer vulnerability to the construction of the proposed development. He also shared concerns regarding flooding, density, and the design of the proposed development.

Nadia Popovici, 20 Royal Chapin Crescent, shared what she believed were misconceptions used to justify intensification within the Yonge and Bernard KDA, as further detailed in her submission distributed as Correspondence Item 3.3.2. She advised of concerns with the proposed density, traffic, safety and lack of employment.

Layna Donatelli, 159 Canyon Hill Avenue, expressed concerns regarding safety, traffic, noise, proposed building heights and the affect that overdevelopment could have on property values. She also compared the amenities that will be provided at the Observatory Hill development to the proposed development.

Marisa Granieri, 129 Cooperage Crescent, advised of concerns regarding the volume and density of the proposed development and shared her opinion that other areas are better suited for development. She also urged the developer and City to build something that they can be proud of.

Moved by: Councillor West

Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

a) That Staff Report SRPRS.20.002 with respect to the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Dogliola Developments Ltd. and Campo Ridge Home Corp., for the lands known as Part of Lots 51 and 52, Concession 1, W.Y.S. (Municipal Addresses: 10898, 10922, 10944 and 10956 Yonge Street), Files D01-19003 and D02-19016, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

4. Adjournment

Moved by: Councillor Chan
Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

That the meeting be adjourned

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 p.m.

Dave Barrow, Mayor

Stephen M.A. Huycke, City Clerk