



64 JARDIN DRIVE, UNIT 1B  
CONCORD, ONTARIO L4K 3P3

T 905.669.4055 F 905.669.0097

[KLMPLANNING.COM](http://KLMPLANNING.COM)

File: P-3420

November 28, 2023

The City of Richmond Hill  
225 East Beaver Creek Road  
Richmond Hill, Ontario  
L4B 3P4

**Sent by Email:** [clerks@Richmondhill.ca](mailto:clerks@Richmondhill.ca)

**Attn: Hon. Mayor West & Members of Council**

**Re: Special Council Meeting November 29, 2023  
Proposed Official Plan Amendment 18.6 to the Richmond Hill Official Plan Village  
Local Centre (the "Proposed OPA")  
Kingsmen Major Mackenzie Inc., Martin Abramian, Harry Harakh, and David  
Lancaster (collectively the "Major Mackenzie Landowners' Group")  
52, 58, 60, 66, 74 and 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West**

---

Hon. Mayor West & Members of Council,

KLM Planning Partners have been retained by the above noted owners collectively the Major Mackenzie Landowners' Group who own lands municipally known as 52, 58, 60, 66, 74 and 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West which consists of approximately .75 ha (1.84 acres) (the "Subject Lands").

The Mackenzie Landowners' Group came together to try and advance a planning framework that allows for comprehensive development to proceed that maximizes the efficient use of lands within a protected major transit station area and that makes it viable to deliver the land and construct the Elizabeth Street extension. In the case of a public road, which we have agreed to in principle, the Elizabeth Street extension will consist of approximately 0.207 ha or 0.511 acres in roads or about 28 percent of the Group's total holdings. Without the co-operation of each owner and the use of development applications to secure appropriate conditions, it will

not be possible to deliver the land and construction of the Elizabeth Street extension, outside of expropriation by the City.

Accordingly, as a stakeholder that has participated throughout this process, we provided comments on the Proposed OPA in our letters dated October 30, 2023 June 19, 2023 and appeared as a deputation at the Public Meeting, Committee of the Whole and Council for the same on June 20, 2023, November 1, 2023 and November 8, 2023 respectively.

In addition, we have met with City Planning Staff with carriage of OPA 18.6 on three occasions, most recently on November 20, 2023 in attempts to resolve our outstanding concerns and requested modifications as outlined to Council in our letter dated October 30, 2023.

At this meeting we expressed concern that the conveyance and construction of the Elizabeth Street extension as a public road will only be viable if the density and height can support the cost and that amendments to the Official Plan related to maximum height and density may not be possible in the future based on the Planning Act legislation without the proposed modifications we presented previously to Council.

At the meeting, staff explained that, in their opinion, the Group's proposed modifications would overly constrain Councils decision making authority in determining the appropriate maximum height and density. To address this concern, we proposed further modifications that would limit any increase density beyond that identified on Schedule E1 Density Allocation to an additional maximum of 1.0 FSI, with provision to allow a potential increase in maximum height for only lands east of the Elizabeth Street extension for up to an additional 3 storeys or a potential maximum of 12 storeys, both of which would be subject to satisfying all other provisions of the Official Plan as part of an application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law. We felt this was a further concession that would simply provide some additional flexibility for Council to consider additional density and height through site specific development details involving applications for rezoning, while providing upset limits to guide or control the ultimate height and density.

As you can appreciate, we were extremely disappointed to be notified days after our meeting, which has been re-confirmed in the November 29, 2023 staff report, that staff are not supporting this approach. We disagree that the approach does not allow Council to guide and evaluate the applications as it only permits the potential for marginal increases, subject to meeting all other Official Plan policies. We believe this is in keeping with the mid-rise character proposed for the balance of the OPA, the maximums of which can only be achieved in a manner that conforms with all other policies which will ensure physical and functional impacts are avoided.

Therefore, this letter is to request that Council adopt the following resolution that contains the requested latest modifications that may allow minor potential flexibility to increase height and density as described above and to allow that the Elizabeth Street extension provide only one (1) sidewalk to connect to the existing approved road design to the north that has been designed and approved with only one sidewalk:

## Proposed Resolution:

That Council adopt recommendation a) and c) contained in the staff report for the Special Council Meeting Report SRPBS.23.045 - Request for Approval - OPA 18.6 Village Local Centre (City File MOPA-23-0001) and that recommendation b) be amended as follows:

b) Official Plan Amendment 18.6 (attached to SRPBS.23.045 as Appendix A) subject to the following further modifications (added modifications are shown in bold):

1) That section 2.2.2.16 be replaced as follows:

2.2.2.16. That policy 4.3.1.1 (11) be renumbered to policy 4.3.1.1 (8), and that the word “site” be added after the word “maximum”, and that the words “of a development block” be deleted, and that the remaining text after the word “Village” be deleted and replaced with “Local Centre is shown on Schedule E1 (Density Allocation).” so that it appears as follows:

“8. The maximum site density within the Village Local Centre is shown on Schedule E1 (Density Allocation). **For lands municipally known as 52, 58, 60, 66, 74 and 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West, additional density not to exceed an additional maximum of 1.0 FSI may be considered for approval through site specific zoning applications provided all other provisions of the Official Plan are satisfied.**”

2) That section 2.2.2.17 be replaced as follows:

2.2.2.17. By adding a new policy 4.3.1.1 (9) with the following text: “9. To ensure that new development within the Village Local Centre is contributing to the minimum density target assigned to the applicable PMTSA area as shown on Schedule A3, new development shall provide a minimum gross floor area equivalent to the application of the following:

a. A minimum density of 1.5 FSI for development located within Development Blocks abutting Yonge Street and Major Mackenzie Drive to which a maximum density of 3 FSI or higher is assigned on Schedule E1. ). **For lands municipally known as 52, 58, 60, 66, 74 and 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West, additional density not to exceed an additional maximum of 1.0 FSI may be considered for approval through site specific zoning applications provided all other provisions of the Official Plan are satisfied.**

b. A minimum density of 0.5 FSI for development in all other areas not identified in item (a).”

3) That section 2.2.2.23 be replaced as follows:

2.2.2.23. That policy 4.3.1.1 (16) be renumbered it to 4.3.1.1 (11) and that the text be deleted and replaced with the following text:

“11. The following height permissions shall apply to development:

a. A minimum building height of 2 storeys;

b. For properties south of Wright Street and Dunlop Street, a maximum building height of 9 storeys, along with a maximum base building height of 3 storeys. **For lands municipally known as 52, 58, and 60 Major Mackenzie Drive West, additional building height not to exceed an additional 3 storeys may be considered for approval through a site specific zoning application provided all other provisions of the Official Plan are satisfied;**

c. For properties located north of Wright Street and Dunlop Street, a maximum building height of 15 storeys, along with a maximum base-building height of 6 storeys and a maximum street wall height of 3 storeys.”

4) That Section 2.2.4.2 be modified by replacing Policy (2) as follows:

(2) Sidewalks shall be provided on both sides of new public streets. **For lands municipally known as 52, 58, 60, 66, 74 and 76 Major Mackenzie Drive West, sidewalks associated with the Elizabeth Street extension shall be limited to one sidewalk to match the existing approved cross section to the north.**

On behalf of our client, we wish to thank the City for allowing us to participate. If there are any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully,

**KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.**



Mark Yarranton, B.E.S, MCIP, RPP.  
Partner

- cc: - Maria Flores, City of Richmond Hill Manager of Policy, Planning and Infrastructure Department  
- Major Mackenzie Landowners' Group