

From: thmcc thmcc

Sent: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 9:52 AM

To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>

Subject: Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment Application - 9651 Yonge Street - City Files D01-21007 and D02-21014

Leigh Ann Penner, Senior Planner Subdivisions

I have reviewed the approved staff report and attachments dated January 17, 2022 for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law and wish to forward the following preliminary comments.

1. As outlined in the staff report the proposed development application seeks approval for an increase in density from 2.5 FSI to 5.0 FSI. This increased requested density will impact the sanitary and water capacity allocation in the City's Official Plan (OP) as well as increased traffic generated by the proposed site development on Yonge Street from the OP traffic studies. If approved, how will the requested density increase impact future OP developments in the future if more allocation is provided to this development than the OP allocation?

2. The City's Urban Design Section provided comment on the adverse shadow impacts from Tower 1 on the site and from Tower 2 on the adjacent site to the north. No comments were provided on shadow impacts on 22 Clarissa Drive the existing high rise residential building located immediately west of the proposed development and close to Tower 3. Recommend that the applicant provide a shadow study which identifies the impacts and mitigating measures to 22 Clarissa Drive especially during the summer late afternoons and evenings.

3. The staff report attachments of January 17, 2022 did not include several supporting documents submitted to the City in support of the proposed development or a link to access these documents. It is requested that all these documents be made available to the public before the Council Public Meeting so the community can review the documents and provide comments or questions to City staff. This request is made for this proposed development and all future development applications.

4. In reviewing the Proposed Site Plan Map 5 of the staff report, the following comments are noted for review by City staff and other agencies as required:

a) The proposed sidewalk along the south side of Tower 1 from Yonge Street will provide pedestrian access to all three Towers and should be sufficiently wide to accommodate pedestrians with wheel chairs and walkers and baby carriages to pass each other with adequate width. Request staff to confirm sidewalk width as it appears that it may not be sufficiently wide to accommodate the pedestrian requirements. Pedestrian sidewalk access to/from Yonge Street to Tower 3 (south east corner of the

proposed development) is not direct and requires walking around the whole interior driveway loop in front of Towers 1,2 and 3. If pedestrians from Tower 3 wish to walk more directly to Yonge Street then they must walk partly along the proposed south laneway across the proposed entrance and exit for the proposed approximately 740 space underground parking garage which will be potentially an unsafe route for pedestrians. Therefore, recommend that the site plan be reconfigured to avoid this problem.

b) The proposed site plan shows 13 at grade parking spaces which includes 2 handicap spaces. The staff report states that 32 retail/commercial parking spaces and 86 visitor parking spaces are proposed. Therefore a majority of these parking spaces will be located in the underground parking garage. For the small number of at grade parking spaces how will these spaces be allocated to retail versus visitor and how will use of these spaces be monitored to confirm use only by the appropriate approved parking user, especially excess use by retail customers?

In addition, in my opinion the two southerly proposed at grade parking spaces immediately adjacent to the underground parking garage entrance and exit will restrict the sight lines of vehicles exiting the underground parking garage ramp and therefore should be eliminated.

c) The proposed site plan does not show a loading bay inside Tower 1. How will the garbage from Tower 1 to be removed from the building and how will residents from Tower 1 be able to move their unit's furniture etc to /from Tower 1?

d) The proposed separation distance from Tower 2 to the Tower 3 north podium area is less than 20 m and was not address in the staff report. How does this meet privacy and skyview issues for the Tower 3 podium area?

e) The proposed layby area for Tower 1 is very narrow and will not accommodate a vehicle within the layby. Therefore a vehicle stopped in the layby area will not provide sufficient driveway lane width for the at grade parking opposite the layby to enter and exit the parking space. Recommend that the proposed layby width in front of Tower 2 also be reviewed. Recommended layby width is 2.5 metres minimum.

regards

Harold McColm

40 Dunvegan Drive, Richmond Hill L4C 6K1