



Council Public Meeting

Minutes

C#32-22

Wednesday, September 7, 2022, 7:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

225 East Beaver Creek Road

Richmond Hill, Ontario

An electronic hybrid Council Public Meeting, pursuant to Section 238(3.3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, of the Council of the City of Richmond Hill was held on Wednesday, September 7, 2022 at 7:30 p.m. in Council Chambers via videoconference.

Council Members present in Council Chambers:

Mayor West
Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli
Councillor Beros
Councillor Sheppard

Council Members present via videoconference:

Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola
Councillor Liu
Councillor Cilevitz
Councillor Chan

Regrets:

Councillor Muench

Staff Members present in Council Chambers:

R. Ban, Deputy City Clerk
S. Dumont, Council/Committee Coordinator
C. Connolly, Legislative Services Assistant

Staff Members present via videoconference:

K. Kwan, Commissioner of Planning and Infrastructure
D. Beaulieu, Manager, Development - Subdivisions
S. DeMaria, Manager of Development – Site Plans
S. Fiore, Senior Planner – Development
J. Mallany, Planner I – Development
D. Pi, Planner II – Development
G. La Moglie, Planner II – Development
S. Mowder, Planner II – Development

Mayor West read the Public Hearing Statement.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Sheppard
Seconded by: Councillor Beros

That the agenda be adopted as distributed by the Clerk with the following additions:

- a) Correspondence received regarding the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application submitted by Stanley Joel Potter for 25 Cynthia Crescent.
- b) Correspondence received regarding the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application submitted by Thomas James Armour and Joan Marie Armour for 34 Cynthia Crescent.
- c) Correspondence received regarding the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application submitted by Neuhaus Puccini Villas Ltd. for 7 Poplar Drive and 11, 15 and 17 McCachen Street.
- d) Correspondence received regarding the proposed Revised Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications submitted by 2867515 Ontario Inc. for 282 and 292 Elgin Mills Road West.

Carried

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest by members of Council under the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

3. Scheduled Business:**3.1 SRPI.22.102 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - Raja Uppuluri - 599 Sunset Beach Road - City File D02-22010 (Related City Files D06-22017 and D06-22018)**

Julie Mallany of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit the creation of one additional building lot on the subject lands. J. Mallany advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Raja Uppuluri, owner, 599 Sunset Beach Road, provided an overview of the subject property's location, and described the proposed development, noting that the property adjacent to his had been severed into two lots. R. Uppuluri provided illustrations of the site plan and front elevations of the proposed dwelling units, and advised that his proposal was largely compliant with the R6 Zone.

Moved by: Councillor Beros

Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.102 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Raja Uppuluri for lands known as Lot 24 and Part of Lot 25, Plan 355 (Municipal Address: 599 Sunset Beach Road), City File D02-22010, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.2 SPRI.22.095 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - Stanley Joel Potter - 25 Cynthia Crescent - City File D02-22011

Diane Pi of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to facilitate the creation of two additional building lots on the subject lands. D. Pi advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Joanna Fast, Evans Planning, on behalf of the applicant, described the subject lands and adjacent land uses, and noted that the existing woodland on the property did not meet the technical criteria to qualify as a

Significant Woodland. J. Fast provided an overview of the proposed site plan, noted the application met all of the development standards of the RU Zone, as amended, and that similar development applications had been made in the neighbourhood. She reviewed the conceptual building elevations and advised that the property owners had gathered 30 letters of support from their neighbours. J. Fast also commented on the correspondence submitted by Allan M. Freedman, included on the Revised Agenda as Item 3.2.1 (1), noting that the subdivision agreements and restrictive covenants that were placed on the lands in the 1970s had expired after 40 years.

Allan M. Freedman, Allan M. Freedman, Barristers & Solicitors, advised that his comments also applied to the proposed development at 34 Cynthia Crescent, listed on the Revised Agenda as Item 3.3. A. Freedman, who represented a number of individuals in the community, advised of their objection to the proposal as it would lead to the loss of trees, vegetation and wildlife, and noted the importance of protecting the Oak Ridges Moraine. He asked that the proposal be denied, as it would set a bad precedent should the severance be permitted, and shared his belief that the original design of the community be respected, and that the property remain a forested lot.

Alana Kanapka, 22 Cynthia Crescent, advised that her comments also applied to the proposed development at 34 Cynthia Crescent, listed as Item 3.3 on the Revised Agenda. A. Kanapka remarked on the unique characteristics of the community, and shared her opinion that the proposed developments at 25 and 34 Cynthia Crescent were a significant departure from the provisions of the Official Plan with respect to lot patterning, scale and character. She shared her belief that new development proposals in the City should be compatible and respect the character of the neighbourhood, and requested that Council object the proposal. A. Kanapka further noted that the subdivision was designed to preserve the existing woodlands.

Frank Casamatta, 51 Cynthia Crescent, advised that he was the original developer of the area. He provided a brief history of the subdivision, noting that it would be disrespectful to the original planning of the area to subdivide lots. He shared concerns regarding the loss of tree coverage and displacement of wildlife, and the precedent that would be set if the application was approved. F. Casamatta further advised that traffic noise would become prevalent if the trees were removed.

Saveria Casamatta, 51 Cynthia Crescent, shared her reaction to the proposed development plans of 25 and 34 Cynthia Crescent, noting that she was surprised that anyone would want to change the fabric of her street. S. Casamatta advised that many residents had improved their homes over the years, and that some had demolished their home and replaced it with no more than one unit. She noted that many residents were not supportive of the lot severance and were concerned with the loss of trees and displacement of wildlife. S. Casamatta advised that the proposed development contradicted the original planning of the area, and noted concern with the precedent that would be set if the development proposal was approved.

Stephen Gooderham, 5 Cynthia Crescent, advised that the proposed rezoning did not fit in with the streetscape and neighbourhood characteristics. He provided a brief history of the development application with respect to 18 Cynthia Crescent, and explained that it received the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board because it did not alter the streetscape, as the proposed development was not visible from the street. S. Gooderham advised that the proposed development was in plain sight.

Gaby Moussaed, 10 Cynthia Crescent, advised that residents lived in the community because they liked their neighbourhood. He noted that he was surprised that the applicant had applied to sever his property as they had previously opposed the severance of 18 Cynthia Crescent. He shared his opinion that what the applicant was doing was wrong, and that the street should remain as it is.

Domenic Tersigni, 53 Cynthia Crescent, advised that he concurred with everyone that was against the project.

Moved by: Councillor Beros

Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.095 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Stanley Joel Potter for the lands known as Lot 8, Plan M-36 (Municipal Address: 25 Cynthia Crescent), City File D02-22011, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.3 SPRI.22.096 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - Thomas James Armour and Joan Marie Armour - 34 Cynthia Crescent - City File D02-22012

Diane Pi of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to facilitate the creation of two additional building lots on the subject lands. D. Pi advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Joanna Fast, Evans Planning, on behalf of the applicant, provided an overview of the subject property, noting that the proposed lots were generally consistent with the lots to the east. She reviewed the proposed site plan, noting that there was the potential that sidewalks and stormwater servicing may be planned for the community and potentially impacted trees were marked. J. Fast provided details of the zoning amendment sought, illustrations of the conceptual building elevations, and noted the properties that were in support of the application.

Allan M. Freedman, Allan M. Freedman, Barristers & Solicitors, shared his belief that the owners of 25 and 34 Cynthia Crescent were aware they were buying a forested lot when they acquired their properties, and that it should remain as such. He also advised that the Planning and Infrastructure Department had commented in the staff report that they were not supportive of the proposed severance.

Alana Kanapka, 22 Cynthia Crescent, advised that her comments were similar to the ones she made with respect to 25 Cynthia Crescent. She noted that they moved to the community believing that they would be protected by the by-laws that were in place. A. Kanapka further advised that she was not against change, but that they were fighting to maintain the standards and by-laws that were in place to protect homeowners.

Frank Casamatta, 51 Cynthia Crescent, expressed concern with the precedent that would be set if the severance was permitted, and shared his belief that it was not fair to allow that behaviour as it may have cascading effects. F. Casamatta asked for Council's support as he intended to fight the application all the way to the Ontario Land Tribunal, and shared his opinion that the severance was money driven.

Saveria Casamatta, 51 Cynthia Crescent, submitted an application to appear, but did not address Council when called as she commented on the application during consideration of Agenda Item 3.2.

Gaby Moussaed, 10 Cynthia Crescent, advised that he invested in his home to make improvements, and that he could have severed his property

into multiple lots. G. Moussaed shared his fear that one day he could see twelve houses across the street from his property, and advised that that he moved to the area to live in peace and quiet, and would fight the application at the Ontario Land Tribunal if necessary.

Stephen Gooderham, 5 Cynthia Crescent, provided a brief history of events at 18 Cynthia Crescent, noting that the application to sever was approved at the Ontario Land Tribunal as it did not alter the streetscape. He concluded by sharing his opinion that the proposed development differed as it did not fit in with the streetscape.

Domenic Tersigni, 53 Cynthia Crescent, noted that he was assured, based on comments made at the meeting, that Council would act in the best interest of the community. He shared his hope that Council was diligent and honest enough to respect the comments made, and concur with the original concept of what Oak Ridges should be. He also shared his belief that some of the past changes made in the community had not been as decent and honourable.

Tom Armour, 34 Cynthia Crescent, advised that there were many residents on Cynthia Crescent and Blackforest Drive that supported the severance as they wanted to block the development of multi-unit townhomes with high quality individual homes. He shared his opinion that the severance into three lots may have gone a step too far. T. Armour further advised that numerous trees in the area were in poor health, or dead, and in need of replacement, noting that in his opinion, the area needed a lot of investment to bring it back to what it looked like twenty-four years ago. He also noted that 100 to 200 pine trees were marked in the event that sewers and sidewalks were built.

Moved by: Councillor Beros

Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.096 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Thomas James Armour and Joan Marie Armour for the lands known as Lot 27, Plan M-36 (Municipal Address: 34 Cynthia Crescent), City File D02-22012, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.4 SRPI.22.099 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application - Neuhaus Puccini Villas Ltd. - 7 Poplar Drive and 11, 15 and 17 McCachen Street - City File D02-22009

Simone Fiore of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit a low density residential development on the subject lands. S. Fiore advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Joanna Fast, Evans Planning, on behalf of the applicant, described the subject lands and the zoning by-law amendment sought, and noted that the proposal closely reflected a development scenario outlined in the Tertiary Plan. She provided an overview of the proposed site plan, and conceptual building elevations for the freehold, single detached and semi-detached units, and addressed correspondence submitted regarding the development application, which was included as Agenda Item 3.4.1.

Fred Anger, 11 Poplar Drive, spoke on behalf of adjacent owners to the subject property, advising that they opposed the change to the zoning by-law. He shared concerns with the height and proximity of the proposed houses to the existing properties, loss of sunlight and privacy, and increase in density and lot coverage. F. Anger shared his belief that the proposed density and height of the dwelling units would damage the outlook of the area.

Dongchuan Luo, 11A Poplar Drive, shared concerns with the height of the proposed dwelling units, noting that it would block sunlight due to its proximity to his home.

Abbas Hassany, 9 Poplar Drive, shared concerns regarding the proposed development with respect to the proximity of the proposed road, visitor parking, and garbage bin placement to his home. He further noted concerns regarding loss of privacy.

David Lui, 11 Poplar Drive, advised that he concurred with the comments made by Fred Anger, and expressed concerns with proposed height of the development as it was much taller than the adjacent homes. He also advised of privacy concerns, as the new development would be located very close to existing residential dwellings.

Moved by: Councillor Beros
Seconded by: Councillor Sheppard

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.099 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Neuhaus Puccini Villas Ltd. for lands known as Part of Lots 6 and 7, and Lots 9 and 10, Plan 484 (Municipal Addresses: 7 Poplar Drive and 11, 15 and 17 McCachen Street), City File D02-22009, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

3.5 SRPI.22.094 - Request for Comments - Revised Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications - Afshin Parker - 313 Harris Avenue - City Files D02-19002 and D03-19002

Giuliano La Moglie of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed revised Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications to facilitate the construction of a residential development to be comprised of one single detached unit and ten semi-detached dwelling units on the subject lands. G. La Moglie advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Frank Venditti, Evans Planning, on behalf of the owner, described the subject property's location, neighbourhood context and development proposal. He advised that the proposed draft plan of subdivision was designed to meet the objectives of the Harris Beech Infill Study and deliver a high quality development to the neighbourhood. F. Venditti outlined the changes to the design of the subdivision that were submitted in the revised applications, and reviewed the proposed zoning by-law amendments that were being sought. F. Venditti concluded by providing illustrations of the conceptual building elevations.

Moved by: Councillor Sheppard
Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.094 with respect to the revised Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications submitted by Afshin Parker for lands known as Lot 2, Plan 65M-2071 (Municipal Address: 313 Harris Avenue), City Files D02-19002 and D03-19002, be

received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried

3.6 SRPI.22.097 - Request for Comments - Revised Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications - 2867515 Ontario Inc. - 282 and 292 Elgin Mills Road West - City File D02-19018 and SUB-22-0004 (Related File D06-21008)

Sarah Mowder of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed revised Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications to permit a medium density residential development on the subject lands. S. Mowder advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Mark Jacobs, Biglieri Group, on behalf of the applicant, began by advising that a revised application was submitted after the owner acquired 282 Elgin Mills Road West. He described the location of the subject property, current uses and neighbourhood context. M. Jacob advised that the area consisted of predominantly single detached dwellings, and that they were seeking to build townhouses in order to provide additional housing opportunities. He reviewed the applicable planning policies that were relevant to the application, described the proposed development, and the zoning amendments that were being sought.

Bruce Rhodes, 3 Tollbar Court, advised that he supported the proposed development, noting that it was well served by public transit. He shared concerns with respect to vehicular traffic and safety at the intersection of Shaftsbury Avenue and Elgin Mills Road West, and shared his opinion that the private road access to the development be located as far east as possible to ensure adequate separation from the intersection.

Julie Tsung, 1 Shaftsbury Avenue, shared concerns regarding the height of the proposed townhouses as it would tower over her home and block the sunlight. She expressed concerns with the location of the private road, noting that the increased traffic from the proposed development may lead to congestion at the intersection of Shaftsbury Avenue and Elgin Mills Road West. J. Tsung also expressed concern with the style of the proposed townhouses, as it was not consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Maria Olindo, 3 Shaftsbury Avenue, shared her displeasure with the proposed townhouses being built at the rear of her home, noting that she believed larger homes would have been constructed instead. She also shared concerns regarding the possibility that garbage bins could be located at the rear of her home.

Moved by: Councillor Sheppard

Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor Perrelli

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.097 with respect to the revised Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications submitted by 2867515 Ontario Inc. for the lands known as Part of Lots 13 and 14, Plan 2404 (Municipal Addresses: 282 and 292 Elgin Mills Road West), City Files D02-19018 and SUB-22-0004, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.7 SRPI.22.103 - Request for Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications - The Canada Life Assurance Company - 0 Leslie Street - City Files D02-22015 and SUB-22-0007

Simone Fiore of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications to facilitate the development of an industrial/commercial subdivision on the subject lands. S. Fiore advised that staff's recommendation was that the staff report be received for information purposes only and all comments be referred back to staff.

Jennifer Jaruczek, IBI Group Professional Services, on behalf of the applicant, described the location of the subject property, the surrounding neighbourhood context, and the applicable planning policies that the proposed development was subject to. J. Jaruczek described the draft plan of subdivision, proposed development, and the zoning by-law amendment being sought. She further shared her belief that the development fulfilled Provincial policy direction, and the Growth Plan, and supported the Region's commitment to maintaining and enhancing the long-term viability of employment lands.

Moved by: Councillor Liu
Seconded by: Councillor Chan

a) That Staff Report SRPI.22.103 with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment and draft Plan of Subdivision applications submitted by The Canada Life Assurance Company and The Canada Life Insurance Company of Canada c/o GWL Realty Advisors Inc. for lands known as Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, E.Y.S. (Municipal Address: 0 Leslie Street), City Files: D02-22015 and SUB-22-0007, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

4. Adjournment

Moved by: Councillor Chan
Seconded by: Councillor Sheppard

That the meeting be adjourned

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

David West, Mayor

Ryan Ban, Deputy City Clerk