

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
1	<a href="#">Letter</a>	<p>Mohammad Maleki-Darbandi</p> <p>Location: 8957 Yonge Street</p>	<p>a) Legal rights of residents impacted by the plan, City's envisioned approach to purchasing and demolishing properties located in the outlined area, valuation methods for property values</p> <p>b) What is the tentative timeframe for which the plan may be implemented</p>	<p>a) While the RHC Secondary Plan describes a vision and introduce new development permissions, the City does not intend to purchase and/or demolish properties in order to facilitate redevelopment and fulfill that vision.</p> <p>b) The process and timelines associated with the Richmond Hill Centre Secondary Plan were modified as a result of the Province's announcement of a Transit-Oriented Community centred around High Tech Station, a future subway station part of the Yonge North Subway Extension, located at the centre of Richmond Hill Centre. The plan is being brought forward for approval by May 2022, with a planning horizon to the year 2051.</p>	<p>a) No change required.</p> <p>b) No change required.</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

**Attachment 2 to SRCM.23.06**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
2	<a href="#">Letter</a>	York Region District School Board	<p>a) Generally satisfied with the conceptual school locations, but the City should consider a phasing strategy which includes a defined threshold of units that can be developed until confirmation of available pupil places</p> <p>b) Open to exploring reduced school site sizes with landowners, the City and other community service agencies and will continue working with the Ministry to identify alternative funding model for schools in high density communities</p> <p>c) Identified funding and operation challenges of urban format schools - integrating schools within a residential building requires significant contributions from other funding sources not</p>	<p>a) Reference to phasing has been incorporated into Schools policies.</p> <p>b) This position is consistent with revised policy number 10.6.2.3: <i>The City will promote that schools within the RHC be built to an urban standard that optimizes the use of land, consistent with the policies or requirements of the respective School Board.</i> Reference to suitable funding arrangements for alternative/ urban school configurations has been added in the RHCS Study Report (October 7, 2021), Section 8.1/page 46, found here: <a href="https://pub-richmondhill.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=43980">https://pub-richmondhill.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=43980</a></p> <p>c) Revised policy 10.6.2.4 continues to recommend strategies to optimize use of land, including integrating schools with development, among others.</p>	<p>a) Revised policy number 10.6.2.2 now reads: <i>The precise location, size and phasing of any school site shall be determined in consultation with the School Boards.</i></p> <p>b) No change recommended.</p> <p>c) No change recommended.</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
			available to school boards, so integrating schools should not be included as a potential means to achieve a smaller school site at this time		

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
3	<a href="#">Letter</a>	Graham Churchill  Location: 12A Mackay Drive	<p>Concerned about the transportation hub and impact on local traffic and livability:</p> <p>a) How is the station going to accommodate CN Rail traffic plus an updated GO train schedule and a subway?</p> <p>b) This area will need a massive parking lot for all regional commuters</p> <p>c) Consider two major adjoining hubs – a city centre to the north, and a traffic hub, with the bulk of its services, to the south</p>	<p>a) Metrolinx coordinates subway and GO trains on the CN Rail corridor. Station design should incorporate this consideration.</p> <p>b) The Province will work with the TOC building partner to ensure sufficient parking is provided during the transition of the area from predominantly low-rise commercial to high-density mixed use. Revised policy number 10.4.6.2 requires parking for new development to locate below grade or where it is not feasible, in structured parking. This policy has been further modified to permit transitional surface parking as required.</p> <p>c) The two-station model described is what's being planned by Metrolinx. High Tech Station is intended to be the city centre to the north, and Bridge Station is the multi-modal hub to the south, as described in RHCSP Section 10.2.9.</p>	<p>a) No change required.</p> <p>b) Revised policy number 10.4.6.5 has been modified to: <i>Surface parking may be permitted as part of a phased redevelopment where a phasing plan and parking monitoring study are produced demonstrating how in subsequent phases the parking will be accommodated in underground or structured forms.</i></p> <p>c) No change required.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>The scope/size of the RHCSP:</p> <p>d) RHCSP area should be broadened to consider a larger framework including the Langstaff Gateway, High Tech over to Bayview, and a broader footprint of the South Richvale area west of Yonge St.</p> <p>e) acknowledges that the Langstaff Gateway is in Markham and suggest Province sets up an independent cross-jurisdictional body.</p> <p>f) the plan calls for some small north-south link streets parallel to Yonge St, but recent development where these link streets should be will make it</p>	<p>d) The Secondary Plan can only include lands that are within Richmond Hill. The West of Yonge Character area is intended to provide transition to the South Richvale area. Bayview Avenue and Highway 7 is a future emerging intensification area with unique character, to be considered as part of future Official Plan updates. Ultimately, the two communities will become integrated and connected.</p> <p>e) City staff have coordinated closely with York Region and City of Markham to advocate for common municipal interests throughout the TOC process. Section 10.2.9 acknowledges the important link Bridge Station plays between Richmond Hill Centre and Langstaff Gateway in Markham.</p> <p>f) The street network depicted on Schedule 5 is informed by the City's Transportation Master Plan.</p>	<p>d) No change recommended.</p> <p>e) No change recommended.</p> <p>f) The Proposed Street Network in Schedule 5 has been modified to show a north-south local street west of Yonge Street between</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>harder to develop these streets later</p> <p>g) concern with the proposed heights of recent applications in West of Yonge.</p>	<p>g) The West of Yonge Character Area policies are intended to balance the need to protect the stable neighbourhood to the west with the higher heights and densities to the east. Development applications in this area are evaluated and considered by Council on their own merit.</p>	<p>Garden Avenue and Westwood Lane, which will continue north to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue subject to an Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>g) No change recommended.</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
4	<a href="#">Letter</a>	<p>Carolyn MacDonald</p> <p>Location: 141 Romfield Circuit, Thornhill</p>	<p>a) Significant concerns with the subway alignment and station location, and consequent impacts of noise and vibration</p>	<p>a) Metrolinx provides an overview of the subway alignment and station locations here: <a href="http://www.metrolinx.com/en/projects-and-programs/yonge-north-subway-extension/faqs">www.metrolinx.com/en/projects-and-programs/yonge-north-subway-extension/faqs</a></p> <p>Modern solutions to manage noise and vibration are also explained by Metrolinx here: <a href="http://www.metrolinx.com/en/projects-and-programs/tunnelling">www.metrolinx.com/en/projects-and-programs/tunnelling</a></p> <p>If the construction of subway follows City policy, Richmond Hill Official Plan polices on complete application requirements in Section 5.3 enable the submission of reports related to noise and vibration.</p> <p>The City will continue to advocate Metrolinx on behalf of residents to minimize the noise and vibration impacts of the subway, during construction and when in operation.</p>	<p>a) No change recommended.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
5	<a href="#">Letter</a>	York Catholic District School Board	<p>a) Please refer to our Board as YCDSB (York Catholic District School Board)</p> <p>b) [Encouraging co-location of community facilities and urban school standards] do not reflect or include any mention of costs associated with construction and long term operating costs of urban/vertical schools. This is also inconsistent with Board policies. As we have discussed previously, Ministry of Education funding benchmarks do not address cost premiums associated with urban/vertical schools and new schools are subject to funding approval by the Ministry of Education.</p> <p>c) Policy language on the identification and location of schools is somewhat limiting and more clarity should be provided; Secondary Plan should include policy language that permits school sites to be relocated, added or removed without amendment to the Plan.</p>	<p>a) The reference to YCDSB/York Catholic District School Board’s name was corrected in the study report.</p> <p>b) Reference to suitable funding arrangements for alternative/ urban school configurations has been added in the RHCSP Study Report (October 7, 2021), Section 8.1/page 46, found here: <a href="https://pub-richmondhill.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=43980">https://pub-richmondhill.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=43980</a></p> <p>c) More flexible policy language has been incorporated into the Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>a) No change required.</p> <p>b) No change required.</p> <p>c) Revised policy number 10.6.2.1 has been modified: <i>Schedule 3 to this Secondary Plan identifies two priority areas for schools. Additional school areas beyond those identified in Schedule 3 may be identified as this Plan is implemented, without amendment to this Plan.</i></p>



Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments

Attachment 2 to SRCM.23.06

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>d) Regarding the policy on strategies to optimize land use, recommending additional language that they be consistent with board policies or requirements, and provided suitable funding arrangements are in place to allow for alternative arrangements.</p>	<p>d) References to consistency with board policies or requirements and alternative funding arrangements have been incorporated into Secondary Plan policy and the study report, respectively.</p>	<p>d) Revised policy number 10.6.2.3 on the promotion of an urban school standard includes language '<i>consistent with the policies or requirements of the respective School Board.</i>'</p>
6	<p><a href="#">Letter</a>, Delegation</p>	<p>Billy Tung KLM Planning Partners</p>	<p>a) <i>[Red Maple policy 1.2.5.1c requiring a minimum 25% of GFA as active at-grade frontage]</i> appears to be contradictory to the policy which encourages the inclusion of a mix of uses. Support the encouragement of a mix of uses and not a mandatory inclusion. Given the subject application represents the last undeveloped parcel in the Character Area, the minimum 25% target over the length of the Red Maple Drive may be translate to the entire frontage under this provision. Request clarification on recreational uses, could it include indoor amenity gym space of residential building? Believe residential units with individual entrances and porches will create an attractive and active street presence, representing an appropriate</p>	<p>a) As there were proposed policies to both encourage and require a mix of uses, and given there is only one remaining undeveloped parcel in the Character Area which is unique from other Character Areas, the two policies in question can be made more consistent.</p>	<p>a) Revised policy number 10.2.5.1(e) is revised to: "<i>Shall be encouraged to provide for a vibrant street character...</i>"</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>street edge treatment facing institutional and park uses.</p> <p>b) <i>[Policy 1.3.3.4 re: Exceptions to the residential floorplate size in accordance with Policy 3.4.1 (58) of the Part 1 Plan]</i> Suggest an additional qualifier be variation in floor plate size coupled with enhanced architectural design to promote variety in tower shapes and interest to the skyline.</p> <p>c) <i>[1.3.4 Integrating Higher Density Development]</i> While appreciating the objective, the SP policy does not appear to provide exceptions to the OP's Policy 3.4.1 (55) for the use of an angular plane other than that specified under proposed Policy 1.3.4.3 for developments fronting the west side of Yonge Street.</p> <p>The subject applications provided rationalization similar to approach to transition being proposed in the draft policy for the west side of Yonge Street.</p> <p>YRDSB advised they are satisfied the proposed built-form will not have a negative impact on the operations of the Red Maple Public School.</p>	<p>b) The reference policy in the parent Official Plan provides sufficient flexibility to 'generally' have a slender floorplate, of 'approximately' 750 square metres.</p> <p>c) In order to ensure consistency, Transition Areas as shown on Schedule 6 continue to include the northern and eastern edge of the Red Maple Character Area at the boundary of the RHC Secondary Plan.</p> <p>However as per parent RHOP policy 3.4.1.55, the angular plane policies in centres and corridors is applicable only adjacent low- or medium-density residential uses.</p>	<p>b) Previously proposed RHOSP policy 1.3.3.4, providing an exception to a parent OP policy, is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>c) The policies of revised Section 10.3.4 have been modified to clarify their applicability across the Transition Areas as shown in Schedule 6.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>Given the unique context of the transition to non-residential uses (specifically a parking area for the institutional uses), request a similar exception policy for the subject lands for consistent implementation along the boundary of the Secondary Plan;</p> <p>OR, eliminate the Transition Areas along Red Maple as shown on Schedule 7 given the institutional and park uses on east side. Our client's application materials provide the rationale and support as discussed under comment #4.</p>		
			<p>d) <i>[1.3.6.1 Regulating Density]</i> Schedule 2 to this Secondary Plan establishes the minimum and maximum densities in the RHC, expressed as Floor space Index (FSI) to be applied to each Character Area. We appreciate and support this approach, which is consistent with the methodology put forth by the subject applications.</p>	<p>d) The approach of having RHCSP's Schedule 2 establish minimum and maximum densities continues to apply in the final draft.</p>	<p>d) Revised policy number <i>10.3.6.1</i> has been revised to clarify that the density ranges in Schedule 2 illustrate density ranges across the Character Area as a whole, with individual developments contributing to the overall CA density.</p>
			<p>e) <i>1.4.6.1 Parking:</i> Should include a statement to encourage reduced parking rates given the available</p>	<p>e) Revised policy number <i>10.4.5.1</i> requires development proponents submit and implement a Transportation</p>	<p>e) No change recommended.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>higher order transit and active transportation options.</p> <p>f) <i>Housing Policies 1.7.1.2.</i> We note that the City’s OP requires a minimum 35% of new housing units to be affordable within the Richmond Hill Centre. We require clarification that this proposed policy is similarly being applied across the entire Secondary Plan area and not a requirement for each individual development proposal.</p> <p>g) <i>Housing Policies 1.7.1.3.</i> [requiring new residential include a minimum percentage of multi-bedroom units]; We note that the City’s OP Policy 3.1.5.6 encourages high density residential developments to provide a portion of units that are suitable for households with children. We believe the existing policy is appropriate and that the proposed Secondary Plan policy is too prescriptive.</p> <p>h) <i>1.8.1.3 Development shall incorporate sustainable water conservation technologies and low impact development</i></p>	<p>Demand Management (TDM) strategy which may include maximum parking rates.</p> <p>f) The EMZO required the City to clarify that the minimum 35% affordable housing does not apply across the entire Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>g) The policy is consistent with Richmond Hill’s endorsed Affordable Housing Strategy.</p> <p>h) This requirement may not be feasible on every site.</p>	<p>f) Additional detail added to revised policy number <u>10.7.1.2</u>: <i>Affordable housing will be provided through the applicable legislative framework, and may be achieved through community benefits charges, and/or Inclusionary Zoning, where applicable.</i></p> <p>g) No change recommended.</p> <p>h) Revised policy number <i>10.8.1.3.</i> is modified to <i>‘have adequate regard</i></p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p><i>measures for stormwater volume control in accordance with the City's Urban MESP.</i></p> <p>We suggest that the provision be revised to include a “where feasible” qualifier. Given the requirement of underground parking structures and the highly urban nature of the envisioned development of the Regional Centre, this requirement may not be feasible on every site.</p> <p>i) <i>1.8.2.1 Through development application requirements, development in RHC will be required to demonstrate how a building is or can be made “District Energy Ready”...</i> This appears to be onerous for applicants to design and build new buildings to include these measures as a contingency. Can heating systems be retrofitted after the fact without being a financial burden on Condominium Boards?</p> <p>j) <i>Schedule 3 Open Space Network:</i> The existing conveyed lands for a planned linear park abutting the subject lands should be identified on this schedule, not a Neighbourhood Park.</p>	<p>i) The proposed policy did not require new buildings to be built DE-ready, but to demonstrate how a building is or could be made DE-ready.</p> <p>j) Schedule 3 is revised so as not to show a Neighbourhood Park in the Red Maple Character Area.</p>	<p><i>for water conservation and LID measures.</i></p> <p>i) Revised policy number <i>10.8.2.1.</i> is modified so development applications in RHC will be encouraged to demonstrate how a building is or can be made DE-ready.</p> <p>j) Schedule 3 is revised to show an undeveloped park in Red Maple Character Area – described as parkland that has already been secured but not yet</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>k) <i>Schedule 5 Proposed ATN: Is there a detail of the proposed Protected Bicycle Facilities? Proposed Policy 1.4.4 only provides a brief description. What are the design requirements? Will it require road widenings to accommodate?</i></p>	<p>k) Revised policy number <i>10.4.4.3</i> describes Protected Bicycle Facilities as: <i>physically buffered from motor vehicle traffic and could include Separated Bicycle Lanes, Raised Cycle Tracks and In-Boulevard Bicycle Facilities.</i></p> <p>The intent where possible is to accommodate active transportation facilities within standard right-of-way widths.</p>	<p>developed as per revised policy number <i>10.5.1.1.</i></p> <p>k) No change recommended.</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
7	<a href="#">Letter</a> , Delegation	John Li Richmond Hill Umbrella Residents Group (RHURG)  Location: 206 Brookside Road	a) Questions and concerns around lack of transparency re: data that informed the study recommendations (FSIs, GFAs).   b) Why does the FSI fluctuate so much in each character area? How can we prevent all developers from pursuing the highest density?   c) Why does the plan exceed the maximum North York Centre FSI so much?	a) A separate meeting with RHURG was held on November 16, 2021 to discuss and address the concerns and provide more background data. The Planning Addendum attached to the Secondary Plan brought forward for approval revises and summarizes the data that informed the Secondary Plan, including resulting changes to FSI and GFA as a result of the High Tech EMZO.   b) Minimum FSIs are based on existing requirements of the Richmond Hill Official Plan; Maximum FSIs are the targeted average for each development block within a character area. As part of the approvals process, proponents will be required to demonstrate how their proposal contributes to this average FSI.   c) The Current North York Centre Secondary Plan, adopted in 1998, was developed in a different planning context to the RHC SP, prior to the current Growth Plan.	a) No change required.   b) Revised policy number 10.3.6.1 is modified to clarify how individual developments will contribute to the average Character Area density.   c) No change required.

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>d) Requested clarification on RHC's future residents # targets</p> <p>e) RHC's growth targets have not changed since 2010 - why is there a plan for up to 70-storey towers? Has the 34-storey height limit around the Buttonville Airport been removed?</p>	<p>d) Differences in previously reported residential population totals, were due to the methodology for accounting for the approximately 5,800 existing residents.</p> <p>e) RHC's growth targets have now been increased by the Province and the Region beyond what was contemplated by the City at the outset of this secondary planning process.</p> <p>The additional density in Richmond Hill Centre is reflective of the Centre's role in the overall urban structure of the city as a new Downtown, in close proximity to a wide range of existing and planned rapid transit options.</p> <p>As an interim policy, despite any enabling policies of the proposed Plan with regards to building heights, the maximum building height within Richmond Hill Centre shall be limited to 323 metres above sea level (approximately 34 stories) until such time as the Federal Zoning Regulations for</p>	<p>d) Section 10.1 clarifies the revised population anticipated including the EMZO lands, 51,000 persons.</p> <p>e) Section 13 is revised to acknowledge the three new applicable growth targets derived from the Protected Major Transit Station Areas designations in the York Region Official Plan (2022).</p>



Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			f) Why is the employment ratio so low?	<p>the Buttonville Airport are no longer in force and effect in respect of the lands or have been repealed</p> <p>f) The Inner and Outer Transit Cores will support the majority of office employment uses in RHC. While originally planned to be consistent with the Region's 1:1 target ratio, the minimum amount of office space to be provided as prescribed by the EMZO is a lower starting point.</p>	f) No change required.
			g) Are two new schools enough for RHC?	g) Both the YRDSB and YCDSB have been consulted during the development of RHCSP, with both agencies having provided comments acknowledged in this matrix incorporated into policy.	g) Revised policy 10.6.2.1 has been modified to read: <i>Additional school areas beyond those identified in <b>Schedule 3</b> may be identified as this Plan is implemented, without amendment to this Plan.</i>
			h) What's the minimum amount of parkland for healthy living? Is there enough proposed parkland in RHC?	h) The Enhanced Ministerial Zoning Order for High Tech TOC includes additional parkland beyond the minimum required to provided as per new Provincial policy direction in Bill 109	h) No change required.

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>i) When will the subway be completed and has the role of the subway been amplified? (during peak hours, only 10% of RH's trips are to downtown Toronto and more people are driving).</p>	<p>i) The Yonge North Subway Extension has a Target Construction Start in late 2023, and a Target in-service date of 2029/2030 (Metrolinx - Yonge North Subway Extension Initial Business Case).</p> <p>The subway will play an important role in transportation for residents, employees and visitors to RHC. The transit investment at Richmond Hill Centre will improve transit access not just to downtown Toronto but across the entire TTC network as well as east-west through the future 407 Transitway.</p>	<p>i) No change required.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
8	<a href="#">Letter</a> , Delegation	Ian Andres Goodmans LLP	<p>a) Timing of the Richmond Hill Centre Secondary Plan</p> <p>The 2010 RHOP and 2010 YROP, which set direction for this secondary plan, are somewhat stale in terms of its policy (do not conform with 2019 Growth Plan or consider population and employment forecasts to 2051). Why is the Secondary Plan being advanced now, given the advanced stages of the MCR exercise?</p> <p>b) Inappropriate Density Limits for West of Yonge Character Area</p> <p>Proposed density limit west of Yonge St is far too low - UGC has been deliberately delineated to include both sides of Yonge</p>	<p>a) Advancing the Secondary Plan towards approval was 'paused' throughout most of 2022 in order to incorporate and respond to new Provincial direction such as the High Tech TOC and EMZO.</p> <p>During this time, the York Region Official Plan was approved, which conforms with the 2019 Growth Plan and includes population and employment forecasts to 2051. RHCSPP now reflects this latest policy direction in terms of Protected Major Transit Station Area density targets for the area.</p> <p>Also during this time, the Richmond Hill OP Review advanced so that the two projects are now more closely aligned in timing, with updates from the OP review anticipated later in 2023.</p> <p>b) West of Yonge is a transition area between the stable neighbourhoods to the west and the highest densities in the Secondary Plan to the east adjacent to High Tech Station. Therefore by design there will</p>	<p>a) Policy 10.1.1 Revised to acknowledge extended planning horizon to 2051; PMTSA's, as introduced by Growth Plan 2019 and delineated in the 2022 YROP, are also reflected in Section 10 of the Richmond Hill Secondary Plan.</p> <p>b) No change recommended.</p>

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>St, and there's inconsistency with existing approvals; it would be wholly inappropriate to impose an artificial density limit anywhere near the proposed 2.5 FSI</p> <p>c) Angular Plane Flexibility for West of Yonge Character Area</p> <p>But angular plane policies only apply to lots with a depth of at least 100 metres and that seems arbitrary (Metroview site is approx. 85 metres deep, but a 20-storey tower can fit comfortably here)</p> <p>d) Metroview wants to see if a compromise can be achieved with the City, instead of a hearing (now adjourned), so it has decided to revise its proposal in the coming weeks to reduce overall height and density (but will not propose the 2.5x density, which it considers too low)</p>	<p>be lower heights on the west side of Yonge compared to the east.</p> <p>As a result of the removal of undevelopable lands from the density calculations, the upper limit of the density range in West of Yonge Character Area has been adjusted from 2.5 FSI to 3.0 FSI.</p> <p>c) Alternative policies to accommodate additional flexibility on heights in West of Yonge have been explored.</p> <p>d) Latest City direction on the Metroview application is outlined in Committee of the Whole Meeting report SRCM.23.05 from March 22, 2023.</p>	<p>c) The 100 metres lot depth requirement has been removed from transition area policies in the latest RHCSF draft.</p> <p>Flexibility on angular planes have been introduced through new policies 13.3.4.3 through 13.3.4.5.</p> <p>d) No change required.</p>



Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments

Attachment 2 to SRCM.23.06

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
			<p>c) Process improvements are required - there should be a forum for residents associations, beyond a few minutes of delegation time</p>	<p><a href="http://www.richmondhill.ca/en/share-d-content/resources/documents/Investment-Attraction-Strategy---March-2022.pdf">www.richmondhill.ca/en/share-d-content/resources/documents/Investment-Attraction-Strategy---March-2022.pdf</a></p> <p>c) A separate meeting with RHURG was held on November 16, 2021 to discuss and address the concerns and provide more background data. Also, a non-statutory Public Information Session was held on February 23, 2023 to provide an additional forum for questions and feedback.</p>	<p>c) No change recommended.</p>
10	Delegation	<p>Leon Li</p> <p>Location: 32 King William Crescent</p>	<p>a) Concerned about how will traffic issues north of Bantry be addressed. Concerned that traffic study doesn't capture true traffic flows as a result of the pandemic</p>	<p>a) Traffic infiltration was a key consideration as part of the study and a traffic assessment was conducted as part of the Transportation Analysis Report found online here: <a href="http://www.richmondhill.ca/en/invest-and-do-business/resources/rhcentre/Appendix-B-2021-10-07-RHC---SP-Transportation-Report.pdf">www.richmondhill.ca/en/invest-and-do-business/resources/rhcentre/Appendix-B-2021-10-07-RHC---SP-Transportation-Report.pdf</a></p> <p>In addition to the Yonge North Subway Extension and other rapid transit options available in the area, the plan also recommends active</p>	<p>a) No changes recommended.</p>

Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments

Item	Format	Respondent	Issue	Comment	Recommendation
				<p>transportation and mobility options together with and Transportation Demand Management strategies to mitigate traffic impacts as a result of development.</p>	
11	Delegation	<p>John Stewart</p> <p>Location: 122 Spruce Avenue</p>	<p>a) Concerned that there are many birds of different species in the vicinity of Sixteenth Ave/Yonge St and that this area would be a good spot for some sort of sanctuary or pond, instead of a parking lot (give the location back to nature)</p>	<p>a) This consideration was noted, however Yonge St and 16th Avenue are outside of the Richmond Hill Centre boundary.</p> <p>There are existing bird-friendly policies in the parent OP, policy 3.2.3(21): <i>To reduce the collision of birds against windows, development shall be encouraged to incorporate bird-friendly design strategies, including reduced reflectivity and transparency of windows.</i></p>	<p>a) No change required.</p>
12	Delegation	<p>Les Klein BDP Quadrangle</p>	<p>a) Noted that one challenging issue are the plans for a second vehicular crossing across the tracks, south of High Tech Rd (Garden Ave) due to severe grading challenges linking Yonge to Red Maple, creating slopes similar to steep slopes of High Tech Rd. This would require complete rebuilding of Yonge St/Hwy 7 off-ramp, creating very</p>	<p>a) Further detail on this issue is included in the main body of the staff report, within section “Mobility and Transportation”.</p>	<p>a) In accordance with the EMZO, more flexible SP policy language is proposed to secure a second high quality east-west multi-modal connection across the rail corridor, subject to further study.</p>

**Response Table for Stakeholder and Public Comments**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
			high embankments along utility corridor. Indicated that own consultant study shows this road is not required to accommodate E-W traffic and would contribute to greater through-traffic. And that a pedestrian crossing here is more appropriate		