

Jennifer Du [REDACTED]  
11 Poplar Drive  
Richmond Hill ON L4E 2X6  
[REDACTED]

September 7, 2022

Council Chambers  
Richmond Hill Municipal Offices  
225 East Beaver Creek Road  
Richmond Hill ON L4B 3P4  
[planning@richmondhill.ca](mailto:planning@richmondhill.ca)

**RE: File: D02-22009**

**Location: 7 Poplar Dr. and 11, 15 and 17 McCachen St.**

Dear Mayor, Councillors, and Planning & Infrastructure Department:

This letter is to express the objection on behalf of the surrounding neighbors to the development proposed at the site located at 7 Poplar Drive and 11, 15 and 17 McCachen Street. The file number is D-02-22009.

The proposal to build 15 units in such a small site will over crowd the area and it is out of character with the area. Constructing 3-story houses with very little distance from the existing houses will block the sunlight and cause overshadowing. The close proximity will also leave the existing families with no privacy.

We have also consulted Mr. Gillard, Planning consultant from AMG GROUP Inc. and he agrees with our concerns. Please refer to the enclosed letter from Mr. Gillard for his comments on this proposal.

The following summarizes the reasons why we object this proposal:

- (1) loss of sunlight and overshadowing
- (2) loss of privacy
- (3) over development and over crowding of the site
- (4) out of character in the area

(5) proposed new house(s) is only 30 feet from the backyard property line

Specific concerns for house 9 Poplar Drive:

(6) the decrease property value with the added garbage bins from the complex behind our home; the possible mismanagements of disposal in my locality and the decaying trash causing foul smells

(7) the increased risk in terms of safety for the proposed 24hr visitors parking lot backing (and potential access) onto our yard; we will have to keep our property illuminated at night with additional security systems to discourage vandalism and possible extreme crimes, like break-ins into our home

(8) increase noise disturbance level with the in and out driving from the 24hr visitors parking at all hours; cars and especially trucks exceed over the acceptable 40 to 60 decibels which disturbs the ambient background noise in our homes and prevents us from enjoying our living space

We highly appreciate your careful attention to this matter!

Yours very truly,

[Redacted signature]

Jennifer Du, 11 Poplar Drive

[Redacted address]

[Redacted address]

[Redacted address]

To whom it may concern,

1. Understanding that the existing bylaw permits an 11m building which is capable of accommodating a 3 storey building as most floors in a residential house are 3.1m, it's not clear why the applicant needs to go beyond the 11m required per the bylaw? The community is currently made up of one storey to 2.5 storey homes but to require an additional increase to almost 12m seems overkill. There are no grade changes that would otherwise cause a situation for single family detached house to be this tall.
2. The predominant building type in this neighbourhood is mixed 1 and 2 storey homes with the exception of the houses near Poplar Drive and Parker Avenue which are at or right next to an intersection with another neighbourhood collector or "spine" street. Development of this scale within a neighbourhood designation seems excessive. The maximum density in a **medium density designation** is 50 Units per net hectare and this development is approximately 32 Units Per Net Hectare. Anything in a neighbourhood designation should not be similar or like in density to a development that is medium density as it doesn't appear that these sites qualify to meet the medium density criteria of being on an arterial street, or collector street or within a study area in proximity to medium density residential because this is clearly stipulated to be along King Road only in the town **Puccini Drive Neighbourhood Residential Infill Study**
3. The maximum lot coverage that aims to be amended is another point that the houses proposed aren't going to resemble or intend to look similar to what is there currently. The increase from the existing 40% lot coverage to 55% lot coverage speaks to the fact that the lots are too small for the houses that the proponent wants to build. If they wanted to build these large homes, then make the lots a larger size to comply with the coverage.

Generally, the proposal has houses that are too tall, on lots that are too small with buildings that are too tall. The bylaw is not unreasonable in the standards and the proposal fails to make a case for the need to modify these standards and the location of such density should be directed more to King Road as the infill study suggests.



**Aaron Gillard**

MCIP, RPP

