

March 22, 2021

The Corporation of the City of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4

Attention: Leigh Ann Penner, Senior Planner – Subdivisions
- and -
Richmond Hill City Council

Re: The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation proposed development applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment zoning amendment (City Files: D01-20014 and D02-20028) at the northwest corner of Arnold Crescent and Major Mackenzie Drive West (the “Proposed Development”)

Dear Richmond Hill City Council and Leigh Ann Penner,

We are a group of neighbours from Innis Crescent, Richmond Hill and the surrounding area. We are a group with a diverse set of backgrounds - some families that have been in the neighbourhood for over 50 years and some who are brand new; some families that have children who have grown up and moved out, some that have school aged children, and some that have toddlers; some families that have dogs; some families with income earners who work downtown Toronto, some that work at home and some that work in the area. **We all have a common concern with the Proposed Development.**

While our group welcomes growth and opportunity in the neighbourhood, we believe that the Proposed Development is a blatant disregard for strategic growth and the sense of community that the City of Richmond Hill Official Plan (the “**Official Plan**”) and applicable by-laws are in place to protect. Based on our understanding of the Official Plan and applicable zoning by-laws, the Proposed Development does not, in any way, comply (or come closing to complying) with the Official Plan and the proposal is not in compliance with the applicable zoning by-laws for the lands in question.

Attached as schedule “A” is a table that sets out the Official Plan and applicable by-law limitations in contrast with the features of the Proposed Development along with our objections.

We would respectfully submit that this is a case of “spot zoning” which generally describes a situation where there is a wealth transfer that unfairly benefits the landowner through approval of an otherwise non-compliant strategy for making changes in an existing comprehensive zoning system. Given the small footprint of the Proposed Development site, the extreme height of the buildings proposed and the surrounding zoning designations, we do not believe that the request to change the zoning by-laws is appropriate. It would unfairly benefit the group of corporations to the detriment of both the residents who will live in the Proposed Development and the existing community (collectively, the “**New Community**”).

We question how this group of corporations and the City of Richmond Hill proposes to satisfy the needs of the New Community. Where will the children play, where will the teenagers hang out, where will the adults (young and old) socialize? How will the City’s recreational programming accommodate the size of the New Community – it is already difficult to secure a spot in swimming and skating lessons and camp registrations, for example.

We believe there has to be a proposal that this group of corporations can present that is more consistent with the spirit of the Official Plan and in accordance with the applicable zoning by-laws. Surely, this group of corporations can ensure that its proposal offers green space and amenities in proportion to its density plans. The Proposed Development, as presented, is non-compliant with the Official Plan, and the applicable by-laws and otherwise inconsistent with what we understand to be Richmond Hill's overall growth strategy. For these reasons we urge the Council to not approve the application for the Proposed Development in its current form.

Respectfully,

A copy of the Petition submitted by Leila Nixon, on March 22, 2021, regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications submitted by The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation for 190, 210 and 230 Major Mackenzie Drive West and 129, 133, 137, 141, 143 and 147 Arnold Crescent, containing approximately 63 signatures, is on file in the Office of the Clerk.

Schedule "A"

Summary of Development Limitations, the Features of the Proposed Development and Objections

Official Plan / By-Laws Limitations	Features of the Proposed Development	Objections
<p>Land designation: Neighbourhood – low-rise residential uses, such as single detached, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings as well as medium density residential uses subject to certain criteria</p>	<p>High density residential development comprised of 4 apartment buildings ranging in height from 10 to 19-storeys with at-grade townhouse dwelling units, and a total of 790 residential units. The residential unit breakdown includes 717 apartment units and 73 4-storey townhouse units with a total of 838 underground parking spaces.</p>	<p>High density residential development inevitably brings more traffic. The Proposed Development only offers two exits. The exit towards the south will be an issue during rush hour commuting hours as traffic flow will be limited by the intersection at Arnold Crescent and Major Mackenzie Drive. This, in turn, will push traffic towards the north exit and into the Richmond Hill Village residential community. There is insufficient crosswalks and lights along Arnold Crescent to maintain a safe zone for pedestrian access, including children walking to and from school and those accessing pick-up and drop-off zones for local daycares.</p> <p>We also note that this location is very close to the local police station, fire hall and MacKenzie Health hospital. Is there a density impact study that shows that the time it will take for first responders to respond to emergencies will not be significantly increased as a result of this drastic density increase?</p>
<p>Land designation: Natural Core - the predominant use of land within this designation shall be for fish, wildlife and forest management, conservation projects and flood and erosion control projects, essential transportation, infrastructure and utilities, low-intensity</p>	<p>The proposed site plan and proposed renderings show <u>no space</u> dedicated to fish, wildlife and forest management, conservation projects and flood and erosion control projects, essential transportation, infrastructure and utilities, low-intensity</p>	<p>Wildlife has been observed in the area (including foxes, coyotes, hawks, and falcons), and a high-density development will destroy their habitat.</p> <p>What amenities will be available to the residents of the Proposed Development and the existing</p>

Official Plan / By-Laws Limitations	Features of the Proposed Development	Objections
recreational uses, unserviced parks and accessory uses	recreational uses, unserviced parks or accessory uses. Indeed, the proposed site plan and proposed renderings show very little green space or other amenities.	community members if the land designated as Natural Core will be used for high density residential dwellings instead? There is a proposed re-alignment of an existing watercourse – to where will this water be diverted?
The Official Plan clearly identifies development areas in Richmond Hill and the Proposed Development site is not one of them. Adjacent to the west, the Trench Street Local Development Area - (Major Mac and Trench) describes a maximum building height of 8-storeys . To the east, the Village District (core downtown Richmond Hill area) limits the maximum building height to 5-storeys . The Official Plan suggests that the Proposed Development site is to be a transition area between the adjacent high density development area to a lower density residential area.	The Proposed Development is described as ranging in height from 10 to 19-storeys .	The Proposed Development is not consistent with the spirit of the development areas identified in the Official Plan. In addition, the four proposed apartment buildings ranging in height from 10 to 19-storeys far exceeds the limitations set in the Official Plan for adjacent designated development areas (i.e., 8 and 5-storeys).
The Trench Street Local Development Area has a maximum floor space index (“FSI”) of 1.5 . The Village District has a maximum FSI of 2.0 .	The Proposed Development far exceeds the adjacent areas with an FSI of 2.35 .	This is another example of the Proposed Development not being consistent with the Official Plan or adjacent designated development areas.