

From: rick

Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2021 6:50 PM

To: Clerks Richmondhill [clerks@richmondhill.ca](mailto:clerks@richmondhill.ca)

Subject: Council Public Meeting C#14-21 Wednesday, April 07, 2021

Please be advised that in connection with the Public Meeting schedule for April 7, 2021 in respect of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications - 607919 Ontario Limited - 8905 Bathurst Street - City Files D01-20012 and D02-20024, I would like to bring the following comment to the attention of Council:

I am a resident of the Teefy area community.

On March 30, 2021 I attended an on-line information session hosted by Councillor Cilivitz in connection with the above noted application. During the session I submitted a CHAT question regarding how traffic levels on Bathurst Street during rush hours (8AM-10M and 4PM-5PM) would be impacted by the proposed Tridel addition of 396 condominium dwelling units and 535 additional cars to already heavy traffic burdens on Bathurst Street. Councillor Cilivitz read the question during the information session.

City planning staff attempted to respond to this question and in so doing essentially provided the following comments and/or words designed to convey the following meaning:

1) Bathurst St. is a regional road within the jurisdiction of York Region, not the City of Richmond Hill. Although the city will make York Region aware of the possible impact of these 535 additional vehicles entering Bathurst St from the proposed development the ultimate decision on how traffic is handled on Bathurst Street is determined by York Region, not the City.

2) The proposed development is intended to be occupied by empty nesters (ie: retired or near retired persons) who will want to sell their existing family homes move into condo units during their retirement and near retirement years. My understanding from this comment from the City planning person was to convey the impression to the meeting that these future residents will not necessarily be people who will be commuting by car during the periods of 8AM -10AM and 4PM and 6PM (the "rush hour time periods") and therefore any concerns about increased traffic burdens will be minimal. I found this answer to be rather strange in that Tridel will certainly be free to sell these units to anyone who can afford them, not just retired and near retired persons. Most people need to work to pay for their real estate investments and history show that this entails going to and from work during rush hour time periods. Also, if it turns out that the future residents will not need to commute by car, then why is Tridel proposing 535 parking spaces for its proposed 396 units?

3) That with the increased popularity of tele-commuting/working from home, more people will not be using their cars to commute during the "rush hour time periods" and therefore the any increased concerns about traffic burdens will be limited. Although its true that the tendency to work from home and commute by car much less has been a feature of the Covid-19 pandemic, how can City staff make this prediction into the future? Again if this prediction

does come to pass then why does Tridel need 535 parking spaces for 396 units? Is it because the reality of the situation is that there will really be up to 535 additional cars entering Bathurst St and exiting Bathurst St onto the development lands during rush hour time periods into the foreseeable future?

4) City staff pointed out that Bathurst Street is expected to be widened to 6 lanes from 4 lanes by 2023. I suppose that this comment was intended to convey the impression that increased traffic burdens as a result of this maximum of 535 additional vehicles from the development will be relieved by this widening. The problem is however that the traffic gridlock on Bathurst St. during rush hour time periods has less to do with the width of Bathurst Street and more to do with the cross traffic bottlenecks at Rutherford Road in the north and at Worth Avenue in the south. I can tell you from first hand experience that during rush hour time periods it is very difficult for cars to enter Bathurst St from Teeffy Avenue and to enter Teeffy when turning left from the southbound lane of Bathurst Street. During rush hour time periods vehicles typically (and contrary to the Highway Traffic Act) block the intersection of Bathurst Street and Teeffy Avenue in both northbound and southbound directions. This creates a dangerous situation which neither the City nor the Region have effectively addressed in the past. Admittedly this situation has not been as bad since February 2020 as many commuters are working from home during the pandemic, but I have no doubt that this will reverse itself once the pandemic is largely over and people return to work outside their homes. Adding up to 535 more cars to this mix during rush hour time periods will only make this situation worse. I understand that the City does not have the jurisdiction to do what is necessary to relieve the bottle necks at Rutherford Rd and at Worth Avenue, but the City does have indirect jurisdiction over how many additional cars it allows to enter Bathurst from the development and to enter the development from Bathurst by directly determining the density of the proposed development.

In summary I would like to thank Council for carefully considering how the implications of increased traffic will adversely affect the residents of the Teeffy area community and to consider how to plan this development in such a way which does not have an adverse effect on what is already a problematic issue for residents of the Teeffy area community. The proposed Tridel development certainly looks interesting and well designed, but in my opinion the addition of 396 units and 535 potential additional vehicles is just too high a density given all the traffic implications we face daily on attempting ingress and egress onto Bathurst St. from Teeffy Avenue and visa versa. I am hopeful that the City will consider a substantially lower density (perhaps 50% of what is proposed?) and that the traffic study will find that this lower density possibly combined with a very short traffic light when exiting the development and no right turns on RED will mitigate the impact of the additional traffic burden.

Thanks again for your consideration

Richard Zakaib