



March 22, 2021

City of Richmond Hill
Community Planning Department
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L2R 7R4

Attn: Ms. Kelsey Prentice

Dear Ms. Prentice,

RE: Application to Amend the Zoning By-law
File No. D02-20019
274 Kerrybrook Drive and 282 Richmond Street
City of Richmond Hill

Since the above-noted application has been presented to Council at its Public Meeting held on February 3, 2021, it is respectfully requested that a Recommendation Report for this matter be prepared and tendered to Council for its consideration.

It is acknowledged that two written responses resulted from the circulation of the notice of the Council meeting to this community. Per your direction, and based on the writer's recollection and meeting notes, a commentary of the input from area residents and Council Members is summarized as follows:

Kim Perdicaris: Traffic—congestion, hospital parking, narrow street, Winter Carnival, restricted on-street parking.

Aesthetics-frontage not in keeping, two storey homes, loss of two trees.

Samuel Cripaul: Signed lease, tree loss, schedule for construction.

Councillor West: Traffic congestion, frontage precedent, tree protection.

Councillor Cilevitz: Number of units.

Staff Report/Comments: Compatibility, Exterior Side Yard, Village Core Guidelines, City owned white cedar,

With respect to the noted comments, I offer the following response:

Traffic: It is my view that the addition of one home will not materially affect the ability of the local streets in this area to convey traffic. Areas of higher traffic volumes are expected to exist nearer to Mackenzie Health Hospital and Alexander Mackenzie High School and the Mill Pond Park, while local traffic volumes on Richmond Street and Kerrybrook Drive are typical to that associated with local roads servicing a predominantly low density community. Further, sufficient on-site parking is to be provided to accommodate the need of the future residents of these homes and expected visitors. While periodic on-street parking may occur on 'special' events, this scenario will not be any different than any other single family residence in this neighbourhood.

Aesthetics/Frontage: The proposed lot frontages of 14.2m, 13.0m and 13.0 metres are marginally deficient from the existing by-law requirement. The difference from the by-law requirement will not be discernable from the public realm. In addition, a built form which is typical to the modern-day reconstruction which has and is taking place within this area.

A variety of lots types exist in this community, many of which feature lesser frontages than which is being proposed, the approval of this amendment will not establish a precedent for this community.

The Planning Justification submitted in association with this application provides a detailed analysis of the immediate and larger neighbourhood. It is quite evident that an array of lot frontages and areas exist in this neighbourhood, many of which, are smaller than that proposed. Due to this varied pattern, a diverse range housing forms are found throughout this area. The proposed lotting pattern will be consistent and compatible with the lot size and housing opportunities in this area.

The future homes will be designed to respect the Village Core Guidelines for single family residences. As such, a compatible built form will result.

Trees: It is noted that six of sixteen on-site and adjacent trees are to be protected. The majority of the tree to be removed are non-native, or compose part of a hedge. Seven native trees are to be replanted. Any deficiency can be being addressed through additional on-site planting or through compensation. The resulting tree programme for these lots will be a composition of higher quality, native trees.


The City owned cedar tree is the end component of a hedge. It would not appear to be practical to retain the last element of the hedge. I have confirmed with Mr. Mark Davies of Urban Forestry, that the hedge is not an element which is to be protected.

Exterior Side Yard: Staff had noted in the Public Meeting Staff Report that a reduced exterior side yard of 2.32 metres is shown on the site plan. It is respectfully requested that the reduced yard be included in the amended performance standards for the flankage home. Due to the modest relief sought, and the width abutting public boulevard, there will be minimal impact upon the use, safety or appearance of the streetline, yet it will provide for a modest increase in living area for this particular unit.

The proposed re-development can occur with minimal if any impact upon the immediate neighbourhood and will create one unit of additional housing in an area where considerable variety of lot sizes and housing forms exist.

Will you please indicate whether Staff have sufficient information to initiate the preparation of a Recommendation Report. Should you have any questions regarding our submission, please contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly



Murray Evans