

**To Council and Mayor**

**From: Pat Pollock**

**For: Council Meeting December 9, 2020**

**Re: Item 13.14, 9251 Yonge Street (Yonge and 16<sup>th</sup>).**

This development at 9251 Yonge Street has increased in size significantly since the OMB approval in 2011. The commercial space of 1300 sq. m. or 13,993 sq. ft has not changed, so the employment /job allocation/business component of this development has not changed. Yet the residential component has increased from 528 units in 2011 to 962 units in 2020, an increase in density from 5.4 FSI in 2011 to 8.77 FSI in 2020. How can anyone justify this density?

This development is too high, too dense and makes the area too congested: even York region indicates (Appendix B of staff report)

a) Any further development in this intensification area should be premised on a comprehensive framework which establishes appropriate heights and densities and a supporting fine grid transportation network.

b) Regional staff are concerned about cumulative impacts of site-specific intensification proposals being approved in advance of a completed Secondary Plan, especially given the remaining redevelopment of this particular area.....

I am concerned about the addition of 434 or 77% more residential units with no consideration for the overall picture. Every person who rents/owns must earn a salary in order to rent/buy a unit.

What the reality is:

a) 77% more residents who need jobs, play areas, parks, greater transportation infrastructure, more parking facilities, etc.

b) no more jobs created (MZO at Major Mackenzie and 404 is now not employment lands but residential lands, complicating the situation further in respect to jobs availability) and no more commercial facilities are provided in this development. Where are these people going to work? Not in Richmond Hill.

c) parking facilities have only increased by 19.6% for a 77% increase in residential units. Since 77% more residents are going to need to travel outside of Richmond Hill to earn a living, there are not enough parking facilities. And that is only considering one person per unit working. If these rents are to be market value, more than one person per unit will probably need to work, Increasing the undesirability of the transportation and parking situation.

d) 77% more people will be travelling outside of Richmond Hill to their jobs, adding congestion to our roadways, earning their income outside of Richmond Hill and contributing to businesses outside Richmond Hill. Richmond Hill needs the tax base of businesses in order to balance the residential taxes and keep them at a lower level. This is not happening with what Richmond Hill is doing. Richmond Hill is encouraging living in Richmond Hill but not working in Richmond Hill nor supporting businesses in Richmond Hill.

e) an increase in lot coverage of 7% from the 2011 OMB development means less greenspace, thus a concern for climate initiatives, a priority of this Council and the residents.

f) if 61% of these units are going to be considered affordable, how is this going to be monitored? There must be criteria in place so that these affordable units go to those who need them.

Overall, there is much work that has to be done on this proposed development. As it stands now, it certainly does not meet the “live, work, play” criteria of the City. It does not provide enough jobs, it does not provide enough greenspace, it does not protect our environment, it does not provide enough parking spaces, it adds to the congestion of our roadways, and there needs to be more community benefits provided for the size of this development. As this plan is presented now, it should not be approved by Council. Send it back to staff to work with the developer on a plan that meets the criteria of what we want in Richmond Hill, not what the developer wants.