

Greetings to our Mayor and Councilors

June 27 2022 Delivered to Council

Today I speak once again of the need for the City to ensure that data received to affect input to the Key Direction Report must be fact check for accuracy. I have previously reported three major inaccuracies and am not clear that these will be addressed although the errors I pointed out have been admitted.

To use the OFFICIAL PLAN UPDATE TO legitimize Elizabeth Street southwards extension to Major Mackenzie Drive West, by passing through 1/3 of my home and lands, and to have the Provincial Land Tribunal, LPAT state in its decision that the process the City Officials employed to process Laurier Homes original Application for a 44 units condo with private turn around internal road, to an 88 homes project served a public road that taxpayers maintain, was admitted as a "CONVOLUTED" process.

That dubious label cast shadows that is akin to cleaning dirty value/money, aka money laundering and by elevating the unclean Elizabeth southward creation into a higher level Official Plan Document, it bypasses the new road approval process entirely.

The process does allow for new public road as Elizabeth Road Southward Extension via expropriation, which by City has chosen not to use. So, the judgements orders that nothing else can be built on this side of the Laurier homes development, it completely wraps it up in heights, internal roads offsets.

- PLEASE EXCUSE ME, ALL PROPERTIES IN THE TRAJECTORY OF YOUR ILL-CONCEIVED ROAD EXTENSION ARE INDEPENDENTLY OWNED AND LPAT SWALLOWED THE WHOLE CABAL OF BLOCK DESIGN WITHOUT LAND OWNERS . TOSSING IN PHRASES LIKE WE ALL WANT TO BE BURIED ON OUT LAND.
- This brings out my memory of around 2016, members of the Arnold Crescent association bringing up going to council for approval to build a crematorium. It is another tactics I endured.

So the "parties" being Laurier homes, City and Arnold Residents expects the homeowners in my cottage lane to grab donate our lands for Elizabeth Street and take it out of our retirement affordable living and from our retirement home equity. This can be interpreted as racially based "DISPLACEMENT OF COLORED". Successfully used by the settlers 425 years ago against the First Nations and now the lip services/recognition are bountiful.

Quickly, it is the birth/creation of the se are the Elizabeth Street southernly extension from Arnold, the Major Mackenzie Drive is a Regional Rapid Transit Corridor and not as stated a local corridor, and lastly that Major Mackenzie Drive West at Yonge street is within the Minimum Density Target of 160 residents/jobs per hectare and not as n/a (maybe not applicable).

In regards to my credentials for speaking, I live here 37 years which I believe is longer than 80% of the councilors. During that time, you may be aware of my family continuing volunteering at health issues, safety, education, mentorship, quality of life, prayerful and our family and these impact lives both locally and overseas. I was a member of the board of directors of York Central Hospital (Now Mackenzie Health) and during that time our operating budget was over \$180 million, patient load at

emergency about 55,000 per year. I saw the opening of attached Nursing Home managed by Extendicare and worked as a volunteer through Ontario's Hospitals Restructuring Mandate from the Province. In short, my family forms part of the heritage in the last 40 years, are not stupid, just plain gullible.

It is our "go along to get along" survival strategy that made us this vulnerable because we still believe that we have unalienable property ownership rights, in Canada and as such enjoy the benefits and protection of our Bill of Rights and Ontario's Property ownership rights.

In 2017, these property rights were "constructively" terminated by a development application process that ends up describing itself as "convoluted", and by documenting its own decision making facts and assumptions.

These are contained in decision rendered by Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) case # PL160150 dated July 2018 to an appeal from Laurier Homes (Richmond Hill). I will outline below a few of the specific examples and whilst I know there may be higher level recourse these do entail significant funding resources that I am unable to provide.

CASE # PL 160015;

Decision Paragraph #1:

The applicant Laurier Homes asked for zoning by-law amendment and draft plans of subdivision for an original development proposal of 37 town homes and 4 single homes. These would access and exist on an internal private condominium road that is going to be maintained by the condo as separation and independent from its entirety up to "Cottage Lane". This position was abandoned for unknown reasons.

Decision paragraph #2:

The decision states that as a result from Arnold Crescent residences LPAT conducted extensive consultations with all the other parties (these being Laurier homes by lawyer Stephen Waque, Isaac Tang; Town Of Richmond Hill by lawyer Sylvan Roleau, Alexis Alyea,; Don Thompson (for residents) by lawyer Virginia Maclean. The original application above was then revised so that the rezoning would permit 88 town homes fronting on a new public road. It states that the town supports the revised application on February 13, 2017 (exhibit4) and as well as Don Thompson. I was advised by the city lawyers and planner that the agreement was confidential from me as it would hurt the economic interest of the developer.

The Elizabeth street southward extension to Major Mackenzie Drive West was given birth by the above agreement. without even as much as a legal title impairment notice in accordance with the laws of Ontario. I believe that this may be very valid ground where a municipal body cannot participate in a secret scheme withholding information from a resident that could hurt financial and economic life in favour of a developer of an adjacent property where the City invoke a law that exist somewhere that would hurt the economic interest of the developer.

Decision paragraph # 5, all others, including owners of properties on “cottage lane” unanimously opposed to the revised application

Decision paragraph 8 (a) (b)

Town staff and council’s resolution to support the resolution was given weight by the tribunal.

Specifically, our ward 4 councilor and all other higher order Mayor and councilors hid this from us and the other owners of the properties on Cottage Lane.

This is abundantly clear as convoluted as per LPAT and I read into it an intent to deceive.

Decision paragraph 16

LPAT accepts the expert testimony of Mr Murray Evans proposal that the low density Elizabeth Road extension represent appropriate transit supportive intensification that would make efficient use of existing municipal infrastructure and services with a Settlement Area.

This sole source expertise applied on a backward basis to the settlement area grossly misstates that the area south of Arnold is itself a settlement area and it truly is just situated within the old village district.

There is a strong recurring theme that to make planning decisions on incomplete advice, erroneous facts is irreversibly harmful, as roads and buildings constructed under such decisions will likely last another 200 to 300 years and will forever demonstrate poor land usage.

Decision paragraph 21 with comments to DDLUS “Downtown Design & Land Use Strategy”

In its entirety the group of its text paragraph a-d in its entirety summarized what in my opinion the convoluted scheme employed by the parties here wants as its end result and these are the 88 town homes with parking and an internal public road called Elizabeth street extension. The tribunal claims to be persuaded that the southerly extension was identified as early as 2009. INACCURATE. I have gone through all the relevant documents and the only document that could conceivably be used the “Downtown Design & Land Use Strategy” has no such direct mention of any new road what so ever that must be a later day construct to fit the doubling of density at Laurier Homes Development in exchange for making a private road public, a clear direct material financial benefit to the developer, an easier way to get to Major MacKenzie for the few homes in the direct settlement area with no economic\commercial benefit and for the City to come out of a jam by punting the problem down the road to future generations our owners on Cottage Lane. However on page 16 of the DDLUS, I find in recommendation 2 where taller buildings may be concentrated at Major MacKenzie Drive and Yonge Streets.

It infringes our property rights arbitrarily done and may have the attributes of a displacement tactic used for your forcing the owners of Cottage Lane to move and without compensation would have to move to a lower standard of living area.

I ask member of Council if any such process kindly repeal it because it may be unlawful to cause displacement without compensation or to repeal it as part of the secondary plan repeal.

In gratuitously in subsection (c) gives the power to this LPAT member to be persuaded for the roads extension beyond and extension of the development property. In fact this significantly impacts 66, 74 and 76 buildable land mass.

The City and its plan development are not run by autocratic leaders but by and requiring consultation , notification, property value loss

I am assured by Senior members of Council that the City has the right to expropriate and compensate with a premium for the lands that they require.

I appeal to Council to remember that in 2019 the downtown secondary plan was repelled and its entirety and construction of this project where it is clearly visible commenced in late 2021 even to commence any road or construction of any type.

In 2014, a developer “Laurier Homes” began the infill development process for the entire woodlot by clearing the most of the woodlot over a week end. The wood lot of 2.05 acres had 411 tagged trees with diameter of over 8 inches, to the north end of my home, and for its entire east west width.

With that sound barrier, there was never exchange of sight, sound, road, trail, walkthrough heights penetration because the trees were dense and tall.

And that woodlot at the south of Arnold Crescent was a barrier that separates the original 1789 settlements at Downtown Village District from the newer community started in 1957 and called “Cottage Lane”– facing Major Mackenzie Drive West .

My family became part of Richmond Hill story of our “Cottage Lane” within “Downtown Village District” Our borders matches all the 4 borders of Lots 32 to 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West.

It is 4.5 acres in all and has 7 homes and a vacant lot and my authorization exist for all the land owners and residents, a 100% cottage life style community. We started in 1957 and pay our own gravel laneway, no public street lights, winthrow, snow removal, no laneways, on pave internal road and no direct public road access, but private laneway to enter and exit from Major Mackenzie Drive West, which has always been classified a regional corridor. We have no backward (northward) northward community connection not even by foot, car of line of sight. These “Cottage Lane” characteristics were all contained in my earlier submissions to OUpdate Committee. I remembered when that Bill was repatriated from Britain. I am not of British ancestry, and do not claim cultural connectedness to main population of the “Downtown Village District” heritage as 78% of the residents of the core but