Alana & Ken Nadeau

Cynthia Cres Richmond Hill, Ont. L4E 2 P8

Date: June 9, 2025

To: Office of the Clerk City of Richmond Hill 225 East Beaver Creek Road Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4 Email: <u>clerks@richmondhill.ca</u>

Subject: Strong Opposition to Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications – Files D01-21006 and D02-21011 (13564 & 13580 Yonge Street and 40 Coon's Road)

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing to express my unequivocal opposition to the Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) applications submitted for the properties at 13564 and 13580 Yonge Street and 40 Coon's Road (City Files D01-21006 and D02-21011). This proposal represents yet another overreach in the growing pattern of outsized developments in Richmond Hill that blatantly disregard our city's Official Plan, Zoning By-laws, and the community's expectations for livable, well-planned neighbourhoods.

When will enough be enough? At what point does Council take a firm and principled stand to defend the long-term livability of our city, rather than continuously accommodating developers who stretch the boundaries of what is appropriate, sustainable, and fair to the community?

1. Gross Incompatibility with Richmond Hill's Official Plan

This proposal is in direct conflict of several cornerstone policies of the Richmond Hill Official Plan (OP), including but not limited to:

• **Policy 3.4.1.58**: Requires development to minimize adverse effects on adjacent properties — including impacts related to shadowing, wind, overlook, and traffic. This development, with its proposed height and density, will dramatically disrupt the privacy, light, and livability of neighbouring low-rise homes.

• **Policy 3.4.1.59**: States that new buildings should respect the "scale and character of existing development." Proposing a large-scale, high-density residential block in an established low-rise residential and small-scale commercial area is not respect — it's disregard.

• **Policy 4.6.1.10**: Focuses on protecting the quality of life for residents. Approving this application would mean permitting a development that sacrifices quality of life in favour of developer interest.

We must ask ourselves — is the Richmond Hill Official Plan simply aspirational, or is it meant to guide real decision-making?

2. Overreaching Zoning By-law Amendments

The applicant is requesting sweeping changes to existing zoning, including increases to:

- **Height** far beyond what is currently permitted or envisioned for the area.
- **Density** that will put unsustainable strain on area infrastructure.

• **Setback and lot coverage** that conflict with community expectations and existing design patterns.

This is not a minor adjustment. This is a wholesale redefinition of what this community is and what it was promised to be. If this application is approved, what is the purpose of the Zoning Bylaw at all?

3. Unfounded Claims and Misleading Rationale

The applicant's Planning Justification Report attempts to present this development as a natural evolution of the area, using buzzwords such as "complete community" and "intensification." But this is not responsible intensification — this is opportunistic overdevelopment. The proposal offers:

• **Increased traffic congestion**: particularly concerning given the site's proximity to already busy corridors and sensitive intersections.

• **Minimal benefit to the public realm**: there is no compelling public amenity or contribution that offsets the extreme scale of the proposal.

The report's analysis fails to reconcile how a 9-storey building containing 272 apartment dwelling units, surrounded by 12 townhouse dwellings will "fit" with the surrounding community.

4. Cumulative Impact on Community Character

We are reaching a tipping point. Each approval of an aggressive, oversized development application sets a precedent for the next one — and another after that. Eventually, we will look around and find that the Oak Ridge's community has been transformed into a congested corridor of towers, traffic, and transience.

When will enough be enough? When will Council draw a line and say that our city cannot absorb development at all costs, and that our policies must actually mean something?

This proposal is not modest. It is not transitional. It is not compatible. It is a bold, speculative development that seeks to change the rules — not work within them. And for that reason, I strongly urge Council to reject the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 13564 and 13580 Yonge Street and 40 Coon's Road.

If we are to uphold the vision, values, and promises of Richmond Hill's Official Plan, this application cannot proceed.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to engaging further during the public consultation process.

Alana Nadeau