



Council Public Meeting

Minutes

C#13-21

Wednesday, March 24, 2021, 7:30 p.m.

(Electronic Meeting pursuant to Section 238(3.3) of the Municipal Act, 2001)

An Electronic Council Public Meeting, pursuant to Section 238(3.3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, of the Council of the City of Richmond Hill was held on Wednesday, March 24, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. via videoconference.

Council Members Present: Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola
 Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli
 Councillor Beres
 Councillor Liu
 Councillor West
 Councillor Cilevitz
 Councillor Chan

Regrets: Mayor Barrow
 Councillor Muench

The following members of Staff were present via videoconference:

K. Kwan, Commissioner of Planning and Infrastructure
G. Galanis, Director, Development Planning
D. Beaulieu, Manager of Development - Subdivisions
D. Giannetta, Manager of Development - Site Plans
D. Cheng, Senior Planner – Site Plans
L. Penner, Senior Planner - Subdivisions

The following members of Staff were present on the 8th Floor:

R. Ban, Deputy City Clerk
L. Sampogna, Council/Committee Coordinator

Acting Mayor DiPaola read the Public Hearing Statement.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Liu
Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli

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

a) Additional correspondence received regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation - 190, 210 and 230 Major Mackenzie Drive West and 129, 133, 137, 141, 143 and 147 Arnold Crescent – Part of Lot 46, Concession 1, W.Y.S. - City Files D01-20014 and D02-20028

b) Additional correspondence received regarding the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – Gates of Bayview Townhomes Inc. - 0 Oneida Crescent – Part of Lots 37 and 38, Concession 1 (E.Y.S.) – City Files D01-19005 and D02-19023

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 SRPI.21.029 – Request for Comments – Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation - 190, 210 and 230 Major Mackenzie Drive West and 129, 133, 137, 141, 143 and 147 Arnold Crescent – Part of Lot 46, Concession 1, W.Y.S. - City Files D01-20014 and D02-20028

Leigh Ann Penner of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation to permit the construction of a high-density residential development comprised of 790 dwelling units on the subject lands. Ms. Penner advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Michael Goldberg, Goldberg Group, representing the applicant, provided an aerial view of the downtown local centre districts, reviewed the proposed Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) boundary, noting that in his opinion, the westerly part of the site was a local development area and explained the application to amend the Official Plan. He highlighted area developments, Official Plan land use designations, open space on the subject lands, and the location and boundaries of the MTSA. Mr. Goldberg reviewed renderings of the proposed development, and explained the site massing, site plan and landscape planning, angular plane analysis, building massing context and ground view renderings.

Navid Tajalli, 59 Arnold Crescent, submitted an application to appear as an electronic delegation to address Council on this matter but was not in attendance.

Brian Chapnik, 110 Arnold Crescent, advised that the Village Core neighbourhood was the last remaining remnant of the old Village of Richmond Hill where the views of the church and historical designated buildings were still visible. He explained how the downtown area was not an area where high-rise development was appropriate or compatible to what was allowed under the Official Plan. He reviewed the staff report recommendations, and noted the lands were designated Neighbourhood and were not within a key development area or within an MTSA and exceeded the associated height and density permissions. Mr. Chapnik advised that he was opposed to the proposed development and expressed concerns with the design, scale, and intensification not being appropriate, and that the proposed plan would require upgrades to the roadways, storm and sewers networks, and additional schools to accommodate children. He requested Council to reject the proposal and encouraged the developer to work with staff and create a revised proposal that meets the immediate needs of intensification that would integrate better in the oldest neighbourhood of Richmond Hill. He shared his vision to include a lower building with fewer residential units that incorporated features such as terracing of buildings to create a boutique feel, wider pathways with more landscaping and a bridge that realigns the natural watercourse to connect Arnold Crescent with the Don Park.

Jonathon Kahane Rapport, 124 Centre Street West, submitted an application to appear as an electronic delegation to address Council on this matter but was not in attendance.

John Kotsopolous, 36 Reman Street, submitted an application to appear as an electronic delegation to address Council on this matter but was not in attendance.

Wilhelm Bleek, 136 Centre Street West, expressed his disbelief with the proposal noting the applicants ignored neighbourhood planning by-laws, traffic and other public transportation considerations. He shared geological concerns and noted the incompatibility of the proposed development, and highlighted historical flooding issues that occurred every few decades in the area. He stated that the applicant was aware of the flooding issues in the area and shared his personal experience and opinion with the applicants proposed solution to reconfigure the watercourse.

Yang Jia, 1 Guinevere Court, submitted an application to appear as an electronic delegation to address Council on this matter but did not respond to the Chair when called.

Dr. Daliah Chapnik, 110 Arnold Crescent, on behalf of Ali Manji, 109 Arnold Crescent, shared his concerns as outlined in the correspondence included as Agenda Item 3.1.3 d) and noted that he was opposed to the proposed development.

Paul Nixon, 16 Innis Crescent, advised that he was a teacher at Alexander Mackenzie High School, located adjacent to the proposed development, and expressed concerns with the proposed development and the impacts to the community and students due to high-density urbanization and less quality greenspace. He also expressed concerns with the redirection of the existing watercourse on the subject lands, as further detailed in his correspondence included as Agenda Item 3.1.3 p). Mr. Nixon requested Council consider the impacts on the lives of students with positive community interaction.

JP Morson, 12 Innis Crescent, on behalf of several members of the community, advised of their objection to the proposed development as outlined in the correspondence submitted by Leila Nixon, dated March 22, 2021, included as Agenda Item 3.1.3 j). He indicated that they were not opposed to development in the neighbourhood, but stated that the proposal disregarded the strategic growth of the City's Official Plan and the applicable by-law's in place to protect the community. Mr. Morson highlighted concerns related to the proposed zoning, scale, density, and greenspace, and requested Council to reject the proposed application in its current form.

Daxing Lu, 48 Bridgeport Street, advised that he was opposed to the proposed development. He reviewed the current neighbourhood, noting the history and architectural features of the area, and indicated the proposed development did not fit with the current characteristics of the neighbourhood. He reviewed concerns related to zoning and density of the subject lands, and indicated that if the proposed development was approved, it would set an example for future developments and would destroy the Mill Pond and the neighbourhood historic area.

David Fleiner, 224 Glenada Court, expressed concerns with the proposed development and explained how the site was problematic including: the watercourse and flood zone; high-rise was not acceptable; traffic issues on Arnold Crescent and on Major Mackenzie Drive; impacts on the existing neighbourhood; and converting prime residential area to high-density on the subject lands, as further detailed in his correspondence included as Agenda Item 3.1.3 o). Mr. Fleiner requested a Peer Review of the applicants study for the area, advised of his support for reasonable development, and stated the proposal was an extreme. Mr. Fleiner requested Council to reject the proposal and that it only be reconsidered after Regional approval with access onto Major Mackenzie Drive, conservation approval for redirecting the watercourse, a plan and for all services to be performed from Major Mackenzie Drive, removal of any high-rise sections, and the elimination of underground parking.

Paul Sambla, 14 Bridgeford Street South, advised that he was opposed to the proposed development and stated that redefining an area of unique single homes with historical significance in Richmond Hill's core area with a proposal of this kind would make the neighbourhood less attractive to live, play and work. He expressed concerns with the watercourse and flooding in the area, indicated that with climate change approaching, storms would become more frequent and severe and noted that residents deserved an appropriate development to avoid a catastrophe. He advised of Council's support of nature that the subject lands were part of the Greenbelt, and noted the importance of preserving and protecting the natural environment and habitat. Mr. Sambla further reviewed concerns related to the proposed size of the development, changing characteristics of the neighbourhood, and increased traffic and safety issues for the community.

Moved by: Councillor West
Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

a) That Staff Report SRPI.21.029 with respect to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by The Acorn Development Corporation, Acorn Major Mack Inc. and Woodcreek Development Corporation for lands known as Part of Lot 46, Concession 1, W.Y.S. (Municipal Addresses: 190, 210 and 230 Major Mackenzie Drive West and 129, 133, 137, 141, 143 and 147 Arnold Crescent), City Files D01-20014 and D02-20028, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.2 SRPI.21.030 – Request for Comments – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – Gates of Bayview Townhomes Inc. - 0 Oneida Crescent – Part of Lots 37 and 38, Concession 1 (E.Y.S.) – City Files D01-19005 and D02-19023

Doris Cheng of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Gates of Bayview Townhomes Inc. to permit a high-density residential development comprised of four towers having heights of 25, 20, 32 and 27 storeys on the subject lands. Ms. Cheng advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Billy Tung, KLM Planning Partners Inc. and Barry Graziani, G+C Architects, representing the applicant, advised that the subject lands was located in the designated Richmond Hill Regional Centre and was an area where transit and subway improvements was targeted. He advised that the subject lands were the only remaining undeveloped lands identified in the Red Maple Character Area within the Richmond Hill Regional Centre Study. He reviewed the existing and proposed height, density and infrastructure in the area, and noted the proposed development would contribute to fulfilling the City's density and population vision for the Red Maple Character Area. Mr. Tung reviewed a contextual map explaining how it related to the existing built out and under construction area of the Red Maple Character Area, and highlighted the intersection improvements for the proposed development.

Michael Frankfort, 211-65 Oneida Crescent, requested clarification regarding relieving traffic congestion and traffic speeds in the area and inquired to the entrance and exit from Oneida Crescent to the proposed building. Mr. Frankfort requested Council to consider adding traffic lights

and a pedestrian crossing on Red Maple Road between Bantry Avenue and High Tech Road to protect the safety of children and residents in the area.

Mona Masoumi, 55 Oneida Crescent, inquired how the subject lands were changed from a proposed townhouse development to high-rise, and noted that increased population would significantly change the area. She expressed concerns with the number of buildings and units proposed on the subject lands, and stated that Oneida Crescent was a narrow street that could not support the proposal on the site. Ms. Masoumi advised that she was opposed to the proposed development and requested Council not support the proposed development.

Leon Li, 19 MacGregor Avenue, advised he has been a resident in the neighbourhood since 2003 and expressed his disappointment with the proposed high-rise development. He reviewed the current traffic conditions, and noted potential traffic concerns with the proposed development in the area. Mr. Li also addressed concerns with the number of proposed units, noting impacts to the local schools, parks and greenspace in the area and provided his opinion on the future Yonge Subway extension to Richmond Hill.

Degao He, 186 Bantry Avenue, submitted an application to appear as an electronic delegation to address Council on this matter but was not in attendance.

Jacky Fang, 104 Revelstoke Crescent, advised that he has resided in the area for 15 years and had witnessed changes in the area. He indicated that he supported the comments made by previous speakers, and addressed concerns regarding density, traffic impacts, and safety issues with the proposed development. Mr. Fang stated that the local school was currently over capacity; the local community centre would not be able to support the increased population, and provided comments regarding the future Yonge Subway extension to Richmond Hill.

Angela Lau, 65 Oneida Crescent, advised that she was opposed to the proposed application on the subject lands. She reviewed the reasons for purchasing an east-facing unit in Richmond Hill and expressed concerns with the proposed development creating shadowing into her unit and other residents. Ms. Lau referenced the City's vision for "building a new kind of urban" community, noting that accepting the proposed development would eliminate the only open space, including air space, in the Oneida Crescent community. She further reviewed concerns with increased traffic and

congestion in the area and requested Council to consider the concerns of area residents and oppose the proposed development on the subject lands.

Moved by: Councillor Chan

Seconded by: Councillor West

a) That Staff Report SRPI.21.030 with respect to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications submitted by Gates of Bayview Townhomes Inc. for the lands known as Part of Lots 37 and 38, Concession 1 (E.Y.S.) (Municipal Address: 0 Oneida Crescent), City Files D01-19005 and D02-19023, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

4. Adjournment

Moved by: Councillor Chan

Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

That the meeting be adjourned

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 9:49 p.m.