

Kaitlyn Graham

To: Sasha Von Kursell
Subject: RE: FW: *Request for Comments* City Files # D01-21009 and D02-21018- 11283 Yonge Street - MON SHEONG FOUNDATION - PNHP Comments

From: Sasha Von Kursell <sasha.vonkursell@richmondhill.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2022 11:14 AM

To: Kaitlyn Graham <kaitlyn.graham@richmondhill.ca>

Subject: RE: FW: *Request for Comments* City Files # D01-21009 and D02-21018- 11283 Yonge Street - MON SHEONG FOUNDATION - PNHP Comments

Kaitlyn,

The Parks and Natural Heritage Planning Section reviewed the submissions in support of the above noted applications and have the following comments for your consideration:

Zoning By-Law and Official Plan Amendment

1. The official plan amendment area, as shown on Schedule 1, should exclude the natural linkage area from the exemptions and be limited to the area where amendment will apply.
2. The "Flood" zone of Schedule "A" to the zoning by-law amendment should reflect the maximum buffer limits from the features, as shown on Figure 3 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation Report. In this regard, the "Flood" zone should include the greater of the 10m or 30m buffers to the associated features.
3. The "Flood" zone shown on Schedule "A" of the zoning by-law amendment should inform the limits of the Nature Linkage land use designation of the official plan amendment.

Natural Heritage Evaluation, Beacon Environmental, October 2021

4. The report and other supporting documents assert that historic policies are the applicable policies for determining the limits of natural heritage and hydrological features, and their associated buffers. We note the historic policies only apply to the extent of the flood plain, as this was the focus of the Elgin East MSP. The Elgin East MSP, and associated OPAs, do not provide any policy direction on identifying non-flood related natural heritage or hydrological features or determining appropriate buffers to these features. In this regard, the report should review and assess the features and impact of the proposal using and applying the most current policy regime and the terms of reference from the Urban Master Environmental Servicing Plan. The report further asserts that the 10m buffer of the historic policies prevail over the legislated 30m buffers, this is contrary to the City's Official Plan Policy which states "the policy which is more protective of the feature or function shall apply".
5. It is our understanding, that the limits of the wetland, as staked by Beacon Environmental, has been reviewed and approved by the Province. Please send us confirmation from the ministry of their acceptance with the staked limits of the wetland.
6. We note that the 30m buffer is shown in a different location on the abutting property to the north. Please ensure that the same feature limits and buffers are consistently applied to each of these applications and revise the figures in the report accordingly.
7. The report should include a recommendations for a buffer to the drainage feature located along the northern property line. The City's official plan considers the drainage feature as a sensitive surface water feature, and it is unclear what limits and buffers should be applied to preserve and protect this feature.

Landscape Plans, Henry Kortekaas & Associates Inc., August 31, 2021

8. We have provided comments directly on the plan and have attached them for your convenience.

General Comments

9. The natural heritage feature and associated buffers should be conveyed to public agency through the future site plan application. The applicant will need to provide an R-plan for our review once the limits of the feature and buffer are confirmed.

Should you require further information regarding these comments, please contact the undersigned.

Sasha von Kursell MURP, MCIP, RPP

Parks Planning & Policy Coordinator

Parks & Natural Heritage Planning

Planning & Infrastructure Department

