

November 20, 2023

The Corporation of the City of Richmond Hill

225 East Beaver Creek Road

Richmond Hill, Ont

L3B 3P4

Peter & Linda Shum

25 Sunnywood Cres

Richmond Hill, Ont

L4C6W2

Attention: Mr. Stephen M. A. Huycke, City Clerk

The following is our official written strong opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application – COLLECDEV (8868 Yonge) LP. City files: OPA-23-0006 and ZBLA-23-0010 – Proposed Residential Development.

Further to our written submission, we both request;

- To be notified of all future decisions on the specific application.

Sincerely,

Peter Shum

Linda Shum

Peter & Linda Shum's written opposition to the COLLECDEV - (8868 Yonge) 2023 OP and Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application

We strongly oppose the proposed development in its present form because of its excessive scale and intensity, (height, density, massiveness), disregard for blended transitional requirements to the abutting 60+ year old well established neighbourhood single family homes (spacing and yard setback, privacy, north side 45 deg angular projection violation, building projections, transitional design), lack of urban living considerations (pedestrian and cyclist friendly form, adequate parking, traffic congestion, noise and general public safety), environmental considerations (storm water management, site water table management, sanitary servicing, waste management, City servicing access, energy efficiency, sufficient parking, EV provisions) and general lack of consideration for the existing long established vibrant neighbourhood.

The proposed development has not met the developmental transitional requirements of the recently updated City and Regional Developmental Standards that were specifically revised to meet the newly enacted Provincial Mandates. The 2016 OMB decision allowing the developer to build an 8 storey retirement home on the specific site, with a maximum density of 2.64 FSI, is ignored in this new 14 storey Condo application which has an FSI of 4.82. Furthermore, transitional requirements of the Richmond Hill Centre Secondary Plan to abutting established neighbourhoods have been ignored in the applicant's proposal.

The specific land in this application is not situated on the Yonge Street main corridor west city block. It is situated on the second westerly city block, well over 120 meters away from Yonge Street, on the west side of Rosewater Street, and directly on the neighbourhood R2 grounds. The Specific Subject Land should be treated as an important transitional zone between the Richmond Hill Centre designation to the east and the existing neighbourhood designation to the west.

The final City Council decision on this property development will form precedent for all future city developments abutting established neighbourhoods as it will shape the city's future character; set a commitment to its vision and future developmental objectives; establish how the City's Official Plans and Bylaws are viewed and treated by others. This is where City Council will make its mark for what it really stands for and accordingly stake its reputation. Along with the local community, we hope that City Council will stand by its objectives, vision and principles, and in doing so, will support its long established neighbourhoods.

Key Highlights of Main Objections

1. The proposed density of 431 condo units on a 0.58 hectare property, with an 4.82 FSI, significantly exceeds the maximum permitted density of 50 units per hectare in the R2 neighbourhood designation and the OMB 2016 approved density maximum of 2.64 FSI for the subject land parcel;
2. The proposed height is contextually not appropriate and as such it fails to achieve an appropriate transition to adjacent and surrounding abutting low-density well established 60+ year old single family home neighbourhood;

3. The scale of the proposal is inconsistent with the City's recently updated developmental Official Plans, as it relates to height, density and transition, and therefore compromises the City's ability to achieve its vision and developmental future objectives;
4. There is encroachment to the 45 deg angular plane along the Westwood Lane frontage. Furthermore, the 10m initial height prior to the 45 deg angular plane application on the west side abutting the existing houses should be reconsidered, as its visually imposing to the abutting residents;
5. The proposal's loading bay and underground parking access is visually imposing into Westwood Lane does not have sufficient spacing for safe operation and will create significant concerns and traffic obstructions on Westwood Lane. The loading bay and u/g parking access should be relocated directly off Rosewater Street. Some screening and recessing should be added to minimize the adverse visual impact;
6. Building front spacing off Rosewater Street should not be compromised and general yard spacing and urban built form requirements should be enforced, as part of the proper transition to the existing abutting neighbourhood and for the safe access of pedestrians and cyclist alike. More details and emphasis on the green space abutting the single home residences on the west should be provided Mature tree planting and landscaping considerations for environmental reasons and appropriate transition to the abutting neighbourhood should be enforced;
7. Adequate parking spaces should be provided for tenants and visitors, with provisions for EVs. The subway is many years away from becoming a reality and these developments should meet the requirements for the proposed occupation timing. With only the smaller two of the adjacent newly built buildings been occupied, and the largest 3rd building still under construction, the parking situation has become unworkable. Desperate new building residents are actively soliciting rental parking on the existing neighbouring houses, with payment in-advance. This proposal's 4th condo building would only make parking worse if it is permitted to be built for subway access that will not materialize for many years to come;
8. There appears to be servicing access deficiencies on the environmental side for storm water management, ground water management, waste management, sanitary control and the like.
9. General lack of urban living considerations on proper sidewalk spacing and landscaping to accommodate pedestrian and cyclist friendly form will reduce neighbourhood concerns;
10. There does not appear to be any accommodation for affordable housing. The city should ensure that the developer provides its proper share of affordable housing for the city.