



Council Public Meeting

Minutes

C#19-23

Tuesday, May 16, 2023, 7:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

225 East Beaver Creek Road

Richmond Hill, Ontario

A Council Public Meeting of the Council of the City of Richmond Hill was held on Tuesday, May 16, 2023 at 7:30 p.m. in Council Chambers via videoconference.

Council Members present in Council Chambers:

Mayor West
Regional and Local Councillor Chan
Councillor Davidson
Councillor Thompson
Councillor Cui
Councillor Cilevitz
Councillor Shiu

Council Members present via videoconference:

Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola
Councillor Liu

Staff Members present in Council Chambers:

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

Staff Members present via videoconference:

K. Kwan, Commissioner of Planning and Infrastructure
G. Galanis, Director, Development Planning
S. DeMaria, Manager, Development - Site Plans
S. Fiore, Senior Planner – Site Plans
S. Mowder, Planner II - Subdivisions

J. Mallany, Planner I – Site Plans

Mayor West read the Public Hearing Statement.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Cilevitz

Seconded by: Councillor Cui

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

a) Additional correspondence received regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications submitted by Norfolk Development Inc. for 162, 166, 170, 174, 178 and 182 Norfolk Avenue – (Item 3.2.3);

b) Additional correspondence received regarding the proposed Official Plan Amendment Application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre for 600 and 650 Highway 7 East and 9005 Leslie Street – (Item 3.3.3).

Carried Unanimously

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.23.052 – Request for Comments – Minor Zoning By-law Amendment Application – Danial Abediniabyaneh and Shakib Bahareh - 229 Rumble Avenue – City File D02-22014

Julie Mallany of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Minor Zoning By-law Amendment application to permit a second floor addition to an existing single detached dwelling on the subject lands.

Johnathan Benczkowski, Sol-Arch, agent for the applicant, advised that the proposed application was a top up of an existing bungalow to permit a second storey addition. He indicated that the proposal had an integral garage located on the eastern portion of the property, and reviewed the proposed height, Gross Floor Area, and the side yard setback for the proposal.

There were no applications submitted from the public to appear as an electronic delegation, and there were no members of the public who responded to the Chair's invitation to address Council on this matter.

Moved by: Councillor Cui

Seconded by: Councillor Thompson

a) That Staff Report SRPI.23.052 with respect to the Minor Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Danial Abediniabyaneh and Shakib Bahareh for lands known as Part of Lot 23, Plan 2299 (Municipal Address: 229 Rumble Avenue), City File D02-22014, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.2 SRPI.23.047 – Request for Comments – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications - Norfolk Development Inc. – 162, 166, 170, 174, 178 and 182 Norfolk Avenue – City Files OPA-23-0002 and ZBLA-23-0003

Sarah Mowder of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications to permit a high density residential development on the subject lands.

Heath Purtell-Sharp, Groundswell Urban Planners, agent for the applicant, introduced the project team for the proposed development, and reviewed the subject site, land use context, Major Transit Station Areas, transit and connectivity, proposed height, number of proposed units, vehicle parking and bicycle parking spaces. Roland Rom Colthoff, Raw Design, agent for the applicant, provided details on various floor plans and renderings for the proposed development.

Ronald Birch, 299 Elmwood Avenue, advised that his property abutted the subject lands and inquired whether his sightlines would be maintained. He advised that Norfolk Avenue was a side street and expressed his concerns regarding traffic, children's safety, and noted the proposed building height was higher compared to existing buildings in the area. He advised that he spoke with the local Councillor who indicated the area was defined a Major Transit Station Area which would increase density for the area, and requested that Council redirect their focus to employment rather than housing for the neighbourhood.

Michael Theodores, 481 Major Mackenzie Drive, reviewed his concerns with the applications size and scope, noting the differences between the current by-law and proposed standards, impact on traffic in the neighbourhood, and the lack of a signalized intersection at Norfolk Avenue and Major Mackenzie Drive East. He noted the project was more aggressive than other proposals along Yonge Street, and reviewed concerns with reduced transit services, as further detailed in his written submission included as Agenda item 3.2.3.

Louise Yang, 165 Sussex Avenue, shared concerns regarding front yard setback, proposed building height, density, parking, outdoor amenities, and privacy. She noted the proposed building was located on a side street and would increase traffic and safety issues in the area. L. Yang advised that Norfolk Avenue was a narrow street, lacked signalized traffic lights at Norfolk Avenue and Major Mackenzie Drive, and requested that traffic concerns be addressed and that the architect modify the design to avoid the inevitable.

Robert Siebert, 165 Norfolk Avenue, advised of concerns related to the proposed building height, and noted shadowing impacts to his property. He reviewed the current traffic conditions in the neighbourhood, stated that drivers used side streets as a throughway to avoid the traffic lights and congestion on Major Mackenzie Drive East, and indicated that the proposed development would further add to the traffic in the area. He advised that the area was predominantly bungalow dwellings and shared his preference to keep it that way. R. Siebert requested Council stand up for the residents and oppose the proposed development.

Gerard Fortin, representing 186 and 188 Norfolk Avenue, advised that both properties were discussed to be purchased, but were somehow set aside, and shared reasons why he believed the developer should purchase the two properties. He advised that adding a development of the proposed size would exacerbate the traffic problem, and provided suggestions on how to relieve traffic in the area. He advised of his agreement with the concerns raised by previous speakers, and noted that changes could be made to maintain the quality of life and keep neighbourhood safe.

Michael Belshaw, 169 Norfolk Avenue, advised that his property abuts the proposed application and expressed concerns related to increased traffic congestion, children safety, construction phases, setbacks, incompatibility with the existing community, removal of mature trees, 45 degree angular

plane, and shadow impacts, as detailed in his written submission included as Agenda Item 3.2.3.

Prescilla Faulkner, 187 Essex Avenue, advised that she supported concerns of the previous speakers, and expressed her concerns with existing traffic on Essex Avenue, the difficulty of backing out of her driveway and indicated that the proposed development would further increase traffic. She shared her recent learning that her property had been rezoned, and asked that the proposed development be looked at closely and ensure that the existing residents are not over compromised, as further included in her written submission included as Agenda Item 3.2.3.

Ulf Boehlau, 153 Essex Avenue, shared his concerns related to infrastructure, specifically hydrogeology in the area. He advised that the infrastructure in the area was old, needed replacement, and reviewed the sewer backup incident that occurred in the area on February 9, 2001, noting how the City responded to the event. He remarked on concerns with climate change, hundred year storm, volume of water run-off in the area, sewer backups, and insurance coverage. He further advised that there were other developments proposed in the area that should also be considered, and inquired how residents will be kept safe from such events.

Sam Huang, 173 Norfolk Avenue, echoed concerns raised by previous speakers, and shared that in the past, 174 Norfolk Avenue applied to build a terrace on top of his detached garage and was denied due to privacy reasons. He expressed his disappointment with the proposed development.

Moved by: Councillor Cilevitz

Seconded by: Regional and Local Councillor DiPaola

a) That Staff Report SRPI.23.047 with respect to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications submitted by Norfolk Development Inc. for lands known as Part of Lots 226 and 227, Plan 2383, (Municipal Addresses: 162, 166, 170, 174, 178, and 182 Norfolk Avenue), City Files OPA-23-0002 and ZBLA-23-0003, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

3.3 SRPI.23.044 – Request for Comments – Official Plan Amendment Application – Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre Inc., 650 Hwy 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc. - 600 and 650 Hwy 7 and 9005 Leslie Street – City File OPA-23-0003

Simone Fiore of the Planning and Infrastructure Department provided an overview of the proposed Official Plan Amendment application to permit a high density mixed-use residential/commercial development on the subject lands.

Lauren Capilongo, Malone Given Parsons, agent for the applicant, advised that she addressed Council in the past and had worked with City staff collaboratively on matters relating to Regional Policy and Urban Structure issues. She reviewed the subject lands, site context, history of the employment area to community area conversion, and the proposed concept and greenspace. She further reviewed the community benefits that the development would provide, and noted that in her opinion, the lands had an attribute that was consistent with a Key Development Area designation. She advised that the lands were located in a Major Transit Station Area, and reviewed her clients request to amend the City's Official Plan for the proposed development.

Derek Tam, on behalf of Dr. Aaron Pun, 31 Laser Court, read his deputation and highlighted the impact the development may have on traffic and the City. He expressed concerns with the proposed development blocking views and sunlight from the existing buildings, construction nuisances, fire hazards on the ground and in garages, sewage overloads, wind barriers, parking shortages, and open space limits for fire dills, as further detailed in his written submissions included as Agenda Items 3.3.1 and 3.3.3. He advised he was opposed to the proposed development and requested Council take action and turn down the application.

Ray Lefaive, 9015 Leslie Street, expressed concerns with re-designating the subject lands from a Local Centre to a Key Development Area, and explained that the site map was misleading as the boundary lines encompassed properties outside of the subject lands. He advised of concerns with the proposed Floor Space Index, and noted he was pleased that staff's report indicated that further analysis was required to determine if the proposed development was appropriate for the proposed application to go forward without further review. He also advised of concerns relating to parks, recreation space, traffic congestion, damage from construction, deep excavation, and effects on mental health after having to live many years through major construction.

Frances Tsoi, 9015 Leslie Street, expressed concerns regarding the applicants misleading information on the boundary lines encompassing

properties outside of the subject lands that impact the Floor Space Index, and shared concerns regarding traffic congestion along Highway 7, and the proposed density for the area.

Dennis Ngai, 9017 Leslie Street, expressed concerns regarding the impact the proposed development would have on the existing buildings in the area, including being subject to years of construction noise and air pollution, proposed height, and the proximity between the proposed buildings and existing buildings. He requested that the Planning and Infrastructure Department organize a public information meeting and invite the developer to make a presentation, and shared his belief that the proposed application did not support the Vision Statement in the City's 2041 Key Directions Report, stated that it would impact all Richmond Hill residents, and requested that Council consider the quality of life for the residents residing in the condominiums at 9015 and 9017 Leslie Street.

Raymond Lam, 9017 Leslie Street, did not address Council regarding the proposed application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre Inc., 650 Highway 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc., for 600 and 650 Highway 7 and 9005 Leslie Street.

Helen Wong, 9017 Leslie Street, reviewed the negative impacts that high density construction projects would have on the existing residential community, including that insufficient road infrastructure would increase traffic congestion, tall buildings would block views, privacy issues, multiple years of construction would be loud and disruptive, and would also impact property values. She noted further impacts to local schools, hospitals, public services, and the environment. H. Wong advised that these were serious concerns of residents and asked that they not be ignored.

Alton Wong, 9017 Leslie Street, advised that any intensification of development on the subject lands would exacerbate traffic along Highway 7. He advised of his preference that the area remain a top destination for people to dine or shop, and added that the main mode of transportation for the area was by car. A. Wong shared his opinion that the area was not a suitable location for a Key Development Area or for nine proposed towers, and that the proposed development was more suitable for intensification at the Yonge and Highway 7 area.

Irwin Lam, 9015 Leslie Street, shared his concerns with the proposed application indicating that it would be a challenge to the City's Official Plan Amendment process and with the approved Key Directions Report. He acknowledged staff's extensive consultations with the City's long-term

plan in identifying centers, corridors and employment lands, noting Highway 7 and East Beaver Creek Road was identified as a Local Centre. He stated that the applicant participated in the review, including submitted correspondence and deputations to have the subject lands re-designated to a Key Development Area, expressed his dismay at the applicant submitting the proposal, and asked Council to support the neighbourhood residents.

Kyle Lam, 9017 Leslie Street, advised that the proposed application would have significant impact on the community and urged Council to oppose the application. He advised that he supported concerns raised by previous speakers and that he too had concerns with traffic congestion, increased pollution, and with the proposed population for the development. He advised that services such as healthcare, education, recreational services, and open areas would need to be increased. He indicated that the proposed development would create severe strain on existing infrastructure and would decrease quality of life for the existing residents. He asked Council to focus on promoting a sustainable and responsible development that would benefit the community to ensure development was compatible with existing landscape and infrastructure, not to overcrowd it, and to keep the residents informed on the application.

Cliff Chu, 9015 Leslie Street, advised that in his opinion, the proposed application was insulting to Members of Council and City staff because the City endorsed the Key Directions Report to guide planning policies and address anticipated land use needs. He expressed concerns with the application being misleading as the boundary lines encompassed properties outside of the subject lands, and with the number of proposed buildings, units, height, and proposed population. He stated that the proposed application was not compatible with the existing neighbourhood.

Jeremy Ng, 9017 Leslie Street, advised that he was opposed to the proposed application, and expressed concerns with traffic congestion, proposed population, and stated that in his opinion, travelling by car and carpooling was the preferred method of transportation. He noted that the future subway at High Tech Road and Yonge Street would not assist with traffic congestion to the east, and that the Transportation Master Plan did not solve traffic for the area. He raised concerns with construction and the proximity of the proposed buildings to the existing buildings, air and noise pollution, lack of sunlight, and stated that the development would look like a concrete jungle.

Clara Chan, 9015 Leslie Street, expressed concerns with the size of the development proposal, noted that residents' safety was at risk as emergency vehicles would encounter traffic congestion in the area, and explained the potential of vehicular accidents, parking issues, and inadequate access points to the subject lands.

William Ng, 9017 Leslie Street, did not address Council regarding the proposed application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre Inc., 650 Highway 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc., for 600 and 650 Highway 7 and 9005 Leslie Street.

Peggy Chan, 9015 Leslie Street, advised of her enjoyment living in the area, and noted that the proposal contradicted the Provincial Policy Statement. She highlighted that the project focused on residential development with minimum job growth opportunities and public service facility availability, and that it was against long-term economic prosperity by increasing traffic congestion and would make it less desirable for people visiting the area. She stated that the proposal was too dense, too high, would lead to the loss of sunlight, views, and health issues. She noted the proposed development was not compatible with the existing character of the area and asked Council to oppose the application.

Paul Lam, 9015 Leslie Street, did not address Council regarding the proposed application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre Inc., 650 Highway 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc., for 600 and 650 Highway 7 and 9005 Leslie Street.

Tony Chan, 9017 Leslie Street, advised that he was opposed to the proposed development and indicated that he and his wife were shocked at the proposal when they received the notice. He shared his opinion on the size of the subject lands, noting that the parcel was small for what was being proposed and that it would look like a concrete jungle. He further addressed concerns with inadequate parkland allocation, and with the notice he received. He requested that the Planning and Infrastructure Department organize a public information meeting and invite the developer to make a presentation with models to scale to better understand the proposal. He indicated that the residents of the existing condo building had a contract with the health club, and expressed concerns with the size and possible reduction of the health club facility.

Lisa Lam, 9017 Leslie Street, did not address Council regarding the proposed application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre

Inc., 650 Highway 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc., for 600 and 650 Highway 7 and 9005 Leslie Street.

Jay Lam, 9017 Leslie Street, shared his views on the changes in the environment, global warming and climate change, and advised that he was pleased that City Council approved the Community Energy Emissions Plan in March 2021. He stated that the proposed application to designate the subject lands as a Key Development Area raised environmental issues. He advised that he was confident that City Council would make a prudent decision on this amendment application, and shared a quote from the Minister of Environment and Climate Change with respect to keeping the planet livable for future generations.

Frederick Woo, LPH15-51 Saddlecreek Drive, Markham, advised that he was opposed to the proposed development and outlined concerns regarding inadequate parking and with the proposal undermining quality of living conditions, and shared his opinion that electric vehicle parking stations be included. He further expressed concerns with traffic congestion along Highway 7 and Leslie Street, displayed photos of development projects in Markham that demonstrated spaciousness, openness and enhanced the City's look, as further detailed in his written submission included as Agenda Item 3.3.3. He requested that Council disapprove the proposed application.

Motion to Proceed Beyond 11:00 p.m.

Moved by: Regional and Local Councillor Chan
 Seconded by: Councillor Cilevitz

That pursuant to Section 5.6.7 of the City of Richmond Hill's Procedure By-law 74-12, as amended, this meeting proceed beyond 11:00 p.m.

Carried Unanimously

Kyle Wong, 51 Rose Way, Markham, expressed concerns regarding the main loading and garbage areas, traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and noted that the proposal contradicted the guidelines of the York Region Municipal Comprehensive Review. He indicated that the Transportation Impact Study suggested using incentive programs to decrease traffic and improve air quality and health by reducing vehicle emissions, and advised of the lack of response from Transport Canada with respect to concerns raised regarding the Buttonville Airport. K. Wong stated that it was imperative that implications for the proposed development were carefully

evaluated and adhered to relevant guidelines and regulations, and that the existing buildings and residents residing at 9015 and 9017 Leslie Street be considered.

Kay Chan, Vice President, Leitchcroft Community Association, ratepayers association registered with the City of Markham, reviewed the Association's boundary and current developments in the area. She shared the Association's statement which urged Richmond Hill, Markham and York Region to work together on new developments along Highway 7 and Highway 404, communicate with residents in the area, keep the population growth sustainable, reduce the number of buildings and floors, and stated that the private road would not accommodate residents and hotel guests. She requested the plan to be revised and include more space for temporary parking to avoid backups to the major roadway.

Moved by: Councillor Shiu
Seconded by: Councillor Davidson

a) That Staff Report SRPI.23.044 with respect to an Official Amendment Application submitted by Parkway Hotels and Convention Centre Inc., 650 Highway 7 East Inc., and 9005 Leslie Street Inc. for lands known as Part of Block 1, Plan 65M-2287 (Municipal Addresses: 600 and 650 Highway 7 East and 9005 Leslie Street), City File OPA-23-0003, be received for information purposes only and that all comments be referred back to staff.

Carried Unanimously

4. Adjournment

Moved by: Regional and Local Councillor Chan
Seconded by: Councillor Cui

That the meeting be adjourned

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 p.m.

David West, Mayor

May 16, 2023

C#19-23

Ryan Ban, Deputy City Clerk