

Harry & Pamela Harakh
66 MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE WEST, RICHMOND HILL, ONTARIO, CANADA L4C 3S2

May 10, 2022

Members of the OP Update Committee,
City of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road,
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4

Chair, DiPaola,

**Planning for 2041 – Official Plan Update, “Key Directions Report Nov 2021”
(KDR), Endorsed February 9 2022.**

Area of Concern: My home at Lot #66 Major Mackenzie Drive West, Richmond Hill, ON., On a Private laneway in Richmond Hill City original land severance records in 1957 shown as “Cottage Lane”.

and for a wholesome picture of developable lands, I introduce and include in “Cottage Lane” all the residential Lots #32 to #76 Major Mackenzie Drive West.

In January 2022, we made written and oral presentations to OPUpdate offices and requested that the draft KDA be corrected to remove 3 sets of data that were incorrect. There has been no response. We were very respectfully advised that our concerns will be put in the file. The corrections request were made prior to endorsement of the KDR. And the errors are significant and material to us thus our intense anxiety to correct them. Specifically they diminish our land use buildability and densities.

I have done extensive research added to my own 36 years experiences in Richmond Hill, growing with my family, and all of us contributing or leading major community volunteer projects, all within the “Cottage Lane”, and I submit herein my report. These are submitted to be foundational for an emerging 2021-2041 MTSA “cottage Lane “ redesign .

Specific Support requested : Correct Requests # 1 to # 3 highlighted below

CORRECTION #1 -INACCURACY, to which STAFF AGREES, BUT ADVISED NO CHANGE WILL APPEAR.

Remove the words, “Elizabeth Street” on top of a line shown on page 68 of the KDR. Figure #2.3-16. **APPENDIX A**

This figure is an aerial view of the Village District Study Area, and at page 68 the word “Elizabeth Street” is plainly visible along the entire western lot lines of property Lot 44-48 Arnold Street continuing southwards to Major Mackenzie Drive west along the western boundaries of lots #66, #74 and #76.

This alleged road does not exist, and whilst it is factually inaccurate, it is most assuredly misleading to the public. And we were also told by real estate professional, that the City's Pre Submission for Planning Development Committee, that the road exists, although we know what is on the properties lines. And no road is there.

By an apparent reluctance to expeditiously make this correction, the integrity of the OPU update personnel or process may be questionable. And, the possibility of unethical acts of representation were made in secret, and nonpublic documents, could arise. Either way, the residents of "Cottage Lane" #66, #74, #76 MMD may be denied quiet peaceful enjoyment of their properties. Respected councilors advised us to keep enjoying our homes and quality of life, because

the City has a proper municipal process to acquire our homes/lands, for the Village District neighborhood use as a local connecting public road, we are all receptive.

The subject is time sensitive because whatever is built now on these lands, a prominent building entrepreneur is already in our land ownership mix, and our objectives are aligned. So land use cannot be impaired.

CORRECTION # 2- MISLEADING CLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE AS A LOCAL CORRIDOR: NO CHANGE PROCESSED But It is A Regional one.

Correct figure 2.1-2 from Major Mackenzie Drive shown as a Local Corridor to be shown as a Regional Rapid Transit Corridor. APPENDIX B

Correct Major Mackenzie Dr from a Local Corridor to its approved Regional Rapid Transit Corridor and elevate our homes to From Village District to PMUC.

Page 44 puts a Regional Mixed Use (PMUC) classification on Yonge street generally between Hwy 7 to Townwood Drive, And on the same page puts Major Mackenzie Drive as a local corridor and a local (LMUC). That is contrary its classification by higher level York Region Official Plan & the YR Transportation Master Plan. Correction request #2 below

City Plan 2041 KDR, Page 10, has a Figure 2.1-2 "Proposed Urban Structure" showing a map with a yellow line for Major Mackenzie Drive. This is an East West road linkage, it is called a "Local Corridor". Major Mackenzie Drive

That Major Mackenzie Drive classification is incorrect and it has in history a memory that it was always a regional road # 25. It was originally Vaughan Road and changed its name to Major Mackenzie Drive around 1957. Also many successive YR Transportation Master Plan 2016, 2018, 2021 makes it clear with no ambiguity that it is a Regional Rapid Transit Corridor. The buildout delay does not take away its regional corridor classification. 1. Please correct.

The lower classification of this regional corridor does not seem to benefit anyone that we are aware of or do have any disclosed reason. It certainly achieves lower expectations

for densities and deprives residents, planners and developers from a fulsome examination of community development and design options.

The impact is more startling when you just oppose this figure 2.1—2 above, with a figure 2.3-1 called “City of Richmond Hill’s Intensification Hierarchy Matrix”, there is a huge shift in moving lands “Neighborhood infill”, the 2nd to last line of the matrix, To the 2nd line at the top, “Key Development Area & Regional Corridor”.

CORRECTION # 3: FOR MAJOR MACKENZIE DR OMISSION OF MINIMUM DENSITY FOR MTSA #40 APPDENDIX C

On KDR, page 44 Table 2.3-1 “**Summary of Intensification Hierarchy, Land Use Designations, And Alignment with MTSA Minimum Density Targets**”, Major Mackenzie Drive is classified and placed within the table as a Local Development Area and “Local” Corridor with a Minimum Residents/Jobs/Ha is shown as **n/a.**(MEANS NOT APPLICABLE)

Whereas it is within the prescribed 500 meters from BRT40, and is on the regional transit supporting MTSA density of minimum residents/jobs/ 160 per hectare. The page 44 figure names the road and refers to MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE generally from Arnold Crescent to Bayview Avenue, and quite deliberately place a minimum density N/A for not applicable.

So follow the KDR to the header page 80 “Major Mackenzie Corridor “ and the 1st sentence thereunder distinctly described what it means by the header Major Mackenzie Drive Corridor.

“The Major Mackenzie Drive Corridor consists of the properties on either side of Major Mackenzie Drive East between Yonge Street and Newkirk Road.

But on reading the remaining 2 pages of content, there is doubt if the content does extend its applicability to our area at lots 32-76 Major Mackenzie Drive west, and targets in section 2.3.3.8.1, maintain current vision and policy framework supporting low-rise development , and section 2.3.3.8.2 ‘the lands north of MM are subject to village core neighborhood design guidelines. Expansion and further intensification of the corridor risks destabilizing these interior area.

Some may say that the above fuels confusion and off the top, a few examples:

2.3.3.8 Major Mackenzie Corridor

1. Quote “Major Mackenzie Corridor, part of Region Major Transit area network” This is confused with my request for correction #2 above where the KDR classifies MM Corridor is local corridor. What is it? It cannot be both as consequences happen.
2. “MM continues to be identified in the YR official Plan as future rapid transit corridor but the timing is uncertain” this is confusing as the OPU update may have

the authority to cherry pick what of the regional laws it will choose to incorporate in our own Official Plan .

3. After the discussion of the regional nature of MM Corridor, in then OPU goes on to impose an undisclosed 2.3.3.8.1 line 3 Maintain current vision and policy framework during this op update supporting low-rise development including live-work units and missing middle.” This then seems to be predetermined in relation to low rise densities.
4. It seems some form of obfuscation can be gleamed.
5. If the above seems all over the place, could it be cause for concern as to due diligence sufficiency, or in the extreme more serious thoughts?.

The OP Committee seems to bypass the group of homes #32-#76 Major Mackenzie Drive West in its work around us calculations, as if we are annihilated.

We do exist, and can be fact checked.

And our legal municipal addresses placed us both on Major Mackenzie Drive and also inside the corridor 170 meters wide corridors Yonge Street rapid transit regional corridors. Furthermore, Major Mackenzie Drive West is currently being designed and on the west side, there is going to be a center of the road bus stop that is similar to the BTR#40 at Hopkins/Elmwood/Yonge streets...in another MTSA Classification.

Please insert the minimum density of 160 residents/jobs/hectare, for the stretch of Major Mac West from Arnold Cres to Yonge Street or even to Church Street. The correction sought is in green below.

The line above within the table commingles the Minimum Target Density residents/jobs/ per hectare of both as “n/a) and in error, applies that minimum density of n/a to the entire stretch of Major Mac from Arnold Cres to Bayview Ave as if they are homogenous character. They are not and the text in section admits that

That says “Major Mackenzie Drive, generally from Arnold Crescent to Bayview Avenue”. There is a gaping omission on the table inside the 4th caption down “Local Development Areas (LDA) and local Corridor

It says:

“Local Development Areas (LDA) and local Corridor York Region Proposed Minimum Density Target per MTSA (residents + jobs /ha

LDA – Bayview N/A	residents/jobs/ha
LDA –Trench N/A	residents/jobs/ha
Local mixed use corridor – Major Mackenzie Drive, generally from Arnold Crescent to Bayview Ave	N/A residents/jobs/ha DELETE

AMENDMENT REQUESTED

Local mixed use corridor – Major Mackenzie Drive, generally from		
Church	Arnold Crescent to Yonge Street West	or even to
	160	residents/jobs/ha
Bayview Av	East of Yonge street Major Mackenzie Drive East to	
	n/a	residents/jobs/ha

JUSTIFICATION FOR ABOVE CHANGE REQUEST

Remove the current placement of #32-#76 Major Mack Dr away from Village District where It is incompatible with that character:

Challenge the legitimacy of 2020 developer submitted Concept plan of our area. Challenge the veracity of statements accepted by OpU that contains our “Cottage Lane” #32-#76 Major Mackenzie Drive W inside the bosom of the Village Core

Height and Density Paradox

- The KDR on page 68-73, and words scattered throughout the Village Local District section, makes lawful maximum heights 5 stories and density of 2.0FSi.
- Major Mackenzie Corridor pages 80-81, supports low rise development, lands north on Major Mac are subject to the Village Core Neighbor hood guidelines preserve and not destabilize interior area.
- Confirming low density and land use changes convert high % of entire land for vehicular traffic, is included unofficial outside developer Concept Plan for The Cottage Lane.
- Yet our Mayors aerial photo in 2 below confirms the existence of 2 highrises at the exact centre of the area seeking protection.
 1. The village core, for over 20 years of interactions and commingling, has as part of your fabric and within the core of core are two high rise building a 9 and a 12 stories that **you have densities that closely matches those of the MTSA AND are a lot higher than that you acknowledge**, and these apartments house over 1/3 of the total core village residents in congregate living lifestyle, and abundance of mature trees and green spaces, homes designed in the 1840, sizes of land and homes, off sets that re different , paved roads with sidewalks, vehicle reliant transportation –the first 10 minutes on foot to public transit does not exist and residents who are not users of transit, taxpayers paid for snow removal and summer grass trees common areas beautification and maintenance, total separation of the north side of Arnold Crescent from the south side and confirming that the Village district is indeed distinct and separate, etc.

2. Our Mayor's current community newsletter April 2022, has an aerial photograph of downtown and Yonge Street and presents identifiable landmarks. **APPENDIX E**

- **Two apartment buildings** towering above the mature trees **confirm the MTSA like density that factually exist in the Core Village** and has been a fabric thereof.
 - At the top left of the post, there is a set of **new 3 stories infill townhomes, at North west edge of Wright and Hall Streets and the right side is the old city hall/the theatre/RHCPA confirms the 3 stories heights expected for new development**, regardless of its being regional corridor or a local road. We will defend greater heights than those targeted to be in the KDR.
 - **A dark green area at the bottom of the post and confirms and that represents the existence of a separation "Village District and Cottage Lane" and the woodlot** in section 2 above as 1 ½ wood lots.
 - The post aerial photo in 4 above must be dated on or before 2015, **because it does not show any cleared land mass, nor the in pictorial land status for the Laurier homes 88 townhouse development**. The yellow highlighted area in concept plan in 4 above is the subject matter this presentation and MTSA regional corridor designations advocated. So as to mitigate developers load of seeking density bylaws amendments not expressly on in the OP, and reduce the cost to develop by millions of dollars in these other development costs.
3. Page 44, table 2.3-1 "Summary of Hierarchy of Intensification.." places our lands as **"LOCAL CENTER THE VILLAGE"**. Of the 4 intersections of Major Mac and Yonge, only the west sides have new buildability and the Cottage Lane is one on the north western corner. Although both are on a regional rapid transit road, KDR Page # 81, directs that **"The lands north of Major Mackenzie are subject to the Village Core Neighborhood Designs Guidelines" (VCNDG)**. The studies giving raise those guidelines, on section 1.2 "study Area" excludes "properties fronting on Yonge Street" similarly total separation and isolation, inability to walk and or drive directly over to "Cottage lane" which is totally separated by 1 ½ acres forest lots and city accepted wood lot (418 city tagged trees)., The Village Core Neighborhood Design Guideline, documents ends by saying, a good model of streets to are Wright, Center, Richmond, Mill, Church< Roseview, Highland Lane. Only the 1st three named streets are within the Village Core, the others are in surrounding areas. Our "Cottage Lane" Major Mackenzie Drive West block was never physically or visually connected as part of the Village District Neighborhood. From its creation in 1957 has been a carve out with total isolation, and was a function of the 150 years separation of the 2 pieces. The attributes of community character as contained in the KDR and adopted as

neighborhood design foundational, between the Village District and the Cottage Lane are very dramatically different and I list some of the most startling ones that can be listed and submitted if it will assist.

4. Attachment #: **is a block Concept Plan perhaps already adopted by the city vision of 2041 growth plan.** This is a public document from the City files APPENDIX F this is what all the text in the KDR is expected to yield as the optimum best compliant community design for 4.5 acres of prime developable lands at the iconic NW corner of Yonge ST and Major Mackenzie Drive intersection. By almost all measures of independent and professional standards to make such land use analysis, the concept plan in vogue needs major alterations and significant improvement to first understand that this area is not an appendix of the Core Village and it is no longer what images of 150 years ago that it wishes to recreate using authority over our lands over 500 meters to your south that you do not have visual line of sight, air quality, pollution of vehicular traffic paved roads, walking pavements, very different building designs, lot sizes, residents demographics and heritage mix, no local streets for tranquility, no commercial or business establishment within, no Mill Pond luxury,
5. In view of the very many inaccuracies (see point 5 below re Mayors Letter) it may be disingenuous for assertions to be made for purpose of influencing the OP Committee that our lands has to be about 3-4 stories high as shown on the City accepted defacto Concept Plan and likely the target vision of KDA, and for MTSA minimum densities in our Cottage Lane will destroy your community. Additionally the total absence of the Laurier Homes additionally 88 Units townhouses on the 2.5 acre immediately south of the core village as Elizabeth Street southward teed perpendicular at Arnold Crescent, thus adding 250 new residents of maybe 250 at the immediate south end of Arnold street and it is shown already in the concept Plan in yellow. Please refer. The development project above is in progress having obtained all site plans and building permits in a few years, and is already sold out for occupancy in Oct 2022. This development is self-sustaining and if the City wishes to disrupt that, it may invoke its absolute power to transgress on neighboring lands, as prescribed.

Separate and Distinct Communities “Village Local District” and our “cottage Lane”. Almost like differences at Mars vs Venus.

6. Our final slide show distinctly different the” Cottage Lane” unit of lots #32 to #76 is in every sense possible’ APPENDIX D

- The “Cottage Lane” to which we belong, was severed into lots in 1957. And so there is a 150 years differences between technology available home building, traffic and travel technology, social and business knowledge base, education and learning, family structures and everything in between.
- I attach 3 pages for clarity,

- A photograph of the design and style of our combined street numbering signs. There were 2 s a separate and for that we also maintain. **APPENDIX D2**
 - a surveyors land layout with a gravel somewhat circular and a center isle is our design and sole burden and benefit, **APPENDIX D1**
 - a photo of the old road condition up to 2019, and the cottage style we live. The home were larger with city serviced water and sewer connections only. With no street lights, no city lot line garbage collections, no paved road pavements, no relief from significant traffic noise and air pollution, no sound barriers, and any other form of city services consumed by all other residents. We paid and are paying the price for our uniqueness both in benefits and setbacks. Our identity are not detachable, nor is it seizable or extractable and we request that continuance or to be “protected from ???” as the KDR seems a forum for such.
 - Residents generally worked downtown Toronto and communte from here. The weekends became extremely cottage like as almost all had inground pools and socialization that goes with that. In fact 2 current residents still work downtown and commute back home not daily due to age.
 - a photo of Cottage Laneway with one of the refitted home demolished.
- So, 1957 was the 1st time that preservation protocols were probably employed and way beyond our experience. But the general growth then has been embedded within the whole community, and many different neighborhoods emerged. The Cottage Lane is so recognized because Richmond Hill embraced the carve out of 4.5 acres as a new community. Our lots were all created with no direct access to a public road although that was a statutory requirement for approving municipal lot addresses. The following steps of getting building permits and completing our homes, commencing occupancy and raising our families are things and records that cannot be undone. It was not connected to or annexed to any activities or living that formal part of the very older Village District. The Cottage Laneway 1 acre of land was given to the city for our benefit for getting in and out of our addresses. In the beginning it was and today still is the only access to our homes. So a 225 years late claim/annexation that we belong to the Village district publicly deceitful and demeans the residents and there

community contributions over residency timeline of 42 years, 40 years, 36 years 22 years, 6 years, 9 months.

- Richmond Hill and its home owners accepted a contract and condition that we all maintain this by own labor, hired labor at our cost for capital cost for driveway, total and full maintenance, winter and summer, trees, getting public services access. We have done our part our contract has not been breached by us.
- Please City do not do bad by that original contract. None of our homes/building are heritage.

Thank You

Harry and Pam Harakh