

From: Jay Lennox  
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 11:58 AM  
To: Clerks Richmondhill <clerks@richmondhill.ca>  
Subject: June 8 council meeting - comments for item 14.2

Hi

As a resident and taxpayer of Richmond Hill it's my understanding that I can submit comments regarding Council Meeting agenda items. As such I would like to submit the following comments regarding item 14.2 Member Motion - Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli - Yonge and Bloomington Park on the June 8, 2022 Council Meeting Agenda.

- First I am for expanding park land in Richmond Hill
- However, we have to make sure that any purchase serves as many people in the community as possible. \$70 million sounds like a lot, but given that the lot my house sits on would cost more than a half a million, 70 will not go very far. This is not money we can afford to burn to satisfy only the residents of Oak Ridges, who are clearly against these lands being developed into housing. There many other groups in Richmond Hill are fighting similar battles - why shouldn't some of the \$70 million be used to help convert the lands they don't want to be developed for housing into park land.
- The motion quotes survey results from Councillor Perrelli's website which are worthless. I have seen how the questions are phrased and it makes it very difficult to cast your real opinion. This is certainly not a survey run by professionals, as questions would never be phrased this way as they would always skew the results. Also there is no demographic data collected, so it is difficult to determine if the respondents are all from Oak Ridges or truly represent a good cross section of all residents of Richmond Hill. To the best of my knowledge the councillor refuses to share the raw data so that someone else can look at it.
- If we really want to survey the general population on an issue like this it should be done as a city initiative with questions that do not skew the results, and collection of demographic data, such as the ward you live in, to make sure the results are valid, and have not been skewed by an aggressive email or social media campaign.
- Oak Ridges already has a vast amount of city and regional conservation authority park land. The fact that it is impossible to use over the summer months is a parking problem, not a quantity or quality problem.
- I really do not see this as a destination park like Central Park in New York or High Park in Toronto. Those parks are close to the centre of these cities, not on the edge. I would be concerned that a park in this location would see more use from residents outside Richmond Hill.
- The battle to buy all of the David Dunlap Observatory lands was a long, hard fight - the city did not fail due to lack of trying - I watched the entire thing unfold (we have lived here for 30 years). We should not rush forward on a decision of this size because of past events.
- Finally, I would like to see a staff report that says this is a good investment of the \$70 million we have for parks - perhaps a report already exists. Assuming one does not exist, allowing this motion to proceed would not be good without an unbiased report and a proper

survey is very bad decision making, especially in an election year. We have large expenses coming in the next several years to redevelop the Mill Pond parks and other park complexes, and we have to make sure that this is not compromised by one massive purchase without proper staff report and discussion.

I am dead set against spending money on this proposed park without a proper staff report that should include the pros and cons of this park versus other options to spend the \$70 million.

Jay Lennox  
413 Tareyton Road  
Ward 4, Richmond Hill, ON