

**From:** David Jiang

**Sent:** Fri 6/5/2020 4:44 PM

**To:** David West <david.west@richmondhill.ca>; Doris Cheng <doris.cheng@richmondhill.ca>; Adam Foran <adam.foran@richmondhill.ca>; Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>

**Copy:** David Jiang

**Subject:** Complaint against 10684 Yonge St Apartment

We are a family of four living at 17 Creekview Ave, the house situated directly next to the proposed development. I am writing to you to express our dissent against the amendments and development application proposed by Sabella Ridge Estates Inc. for 10684 and 10692 Yonge Street. I am deeply disappointed that such a proposal was even tabled as it expresses a clear disregard for the community as a whole just for the sake of making quick personal gains.

On a macro level, this area is designated as a Mixed-Use area situated between the Key Development Area and the Uptown District. The proposed building will be the tallest building by far, the only comparable buildings will be those near the Integrated Transit Hub at Hwy 7 and Yonge. This building will become the landmark of Yonge/Elgin Mills intersection, and not in an appealing way. Such a tall building violates the spirit of the City's Official Plan in that the tallest building should be centered around Key Development Areas, (i.e. the Transit Hub) and buildings should gradually decrease in height to smooth the transition to residential areas. Clearly, if such large buildings were erected, it should first be done at the Bernard Key Development Area. The developer bought the land understanding the by-laws currently in place, and now seeks to amend the face of the by-law just for the sake of its own profits? What about all the other developers on Yonge Street that followed the rules?

In addition, the current infrastructure in place cannot support such a large population moving in. Consider child care, schools, and roads; they are already scarce and congested as it is right now. The large population moving over will surely cause traffic congestion where Creekview and Arten Ave is not ready for. By providing only 274 parking spaces for the 284 proposed units, the cars will be overflowing to Creekview and Arten Ave congesting the roads, adding traffic, and increasing traffic safety risk for the community.

It also brings the question: why should the zoning rules that apply to lots with Yonge St. frontage be extended all the way into a designated residential area? Sure, 10684 Yonge St is a large lot that extends from Yonge Street all the way to the corner of Creekview and Arten Ave. However, these two areas are clearly separated and distinct between commercial-use and residential.

On a more detailed level, I have prepared a separate attached document listing the amendments that Sabella is seeking. And we are against all of these amendments:

1. Lower Flood Risk Assessment Requirement
2. Decrease the minimum parking space required

3. Allow full move access along Creekview and Arten Ave
4. Increase building density requirement
5. Increase the maximum angular plane for building height
6. Increase maximum building height

All of these amendments are nothing but a pathetic attempt at making profits, which negatively affects the community as a whole. The act of lowering Flood Risk Assessment requirements from performing a comprehensive assessment to an individualized/zoned assessment is just purely selfish and puts the community risk at complete disregard. They also seek to cut costs by not providing enough parking space to house their own units. No doubt, the overflowing cars will be parked on Arten and Creekview Ave, at the community's expense. Robbery in its simplest form.

The developer also proposes amendments to building density requirement, calculation method for angular plane and maximum building height. All of these details are listed in the separate document provided. It is interesting to note that not only will this building be the tallest building in the vicinity spanning several blocks south to the Transit Hub, it will also loom 4 storeys taller than ANY OTHER building in the city. There is no legitimate reason for such amendment other than to maximize profit. Absolutely no consideration was given to the spirit of the city's plan to build a unique and vibrant city in drafting this proposal and it should be rejected as such.

Thank you for reading thus far. As we will be directly impacted by this development, please put yourself in our shoes and imagine this: a large 28 storey building suddenly spouts up right next to your house, looms over and blocks out the sunlight from more than one direction; there is a large driveway right next to your front door where hundreds of car moves in and out every day; what used to be a safe, quiet street is now filled with cars and children can no longer safely play.

Please do not allow this development to happen.

Sincerely,

David Jiang

P.S. This is where the proposed driveway will be. Also additional information attached.

