ADDITIONS MEMO NO. 2
Committee of the Whole – July 5, 2010

July 5, 2010

MEMO TO: Chairperson Beros and Members of Committee

FROM: Donna L. McLarty
Town Clerk

SUBJECT: Additional Correspondence - Richmond Hill Draft Official Plan - to be considered at the July 5, 2010 Committee of the Whole Meeting

---

Please find attached additional correspondence that has been received by the Office of the Clerk respecting the Draft Official Plan.

17. Additional Correspondence received regarding the Richmond Hill Draft Official Plan

That the following additional correspondence regarding the Richmond Hill Draft Official Plan be received:

39. Correspondence from Lillian and Scott Thompson, 104 Baker Avenue, dated June 28, 2010. *(Page No. 391)*

40. Correspondence from Thomas and Hazel Steenson, 24 Weldrick Road West, dated July 3, 2010. *(Page No. 393)*

41. Correspondence from Anthony Montanaro, on behalf of Montanaro Estates Limited, 12860 Leslie Street, dated July 4, 2010. *(Page Nos. 395 - 396)*

42. Correspondence from Michael Theodores, 481 Major Mackenzie Drive East, dated July 4, 2010. *(Page Nos. 397 - 408)*

43. Correspondence from Donald C. Hindson, Cattanach Hindson Sutton VanVeldhuizen LLP, on behalf of Maria Gatzios, Gatzios Planning+Development Consultants, dated July 5, 2010. *(Page Nos. 409 - 412)*

44. Correspondence from Stephen I. Fagyas, Commercial Focus Advisory Services Inc., on behalf of the owners of 10731 Yonge Street, 39 and 41 Elgin Mills East and 10720 Yonge Street, dated July 5, 2010. *(Page No. 413)*

45. Correspondence from Frank Shostack, Black Sutherland LLP, on behalf of Feldbar Holdings Limited and S & E Consultants Limited, dated July 5, 2010. *(Page No. 415)*

46. Correspondence from Barry A. Horosko, Bratty and Partners LLP, on behalf of 1612072 Ontario Inc. c/o Liberty Development Corporation, dated July 5, 2010. *(Page Nos. 417 - 418)*

47. Correspondence from Rosemarie L. Humphries, President, Humphries Planning Group Inc., on behalf of Westgrant Investments Limited, 60 Granton Drive, dated July 5, 2010. *(Page Nos. 419 - 420)*

Donna L. McLarty
Town Clerk

28 June 2010

Mayor and Members of Council
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario
Canada L4B 3P4

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of Council,

As a resident of **104 Baker Avenue,** I would like to show my support for the new Official Plan. The residential area that borders Major Mac should be protected with a 4 story limit (as in the official plan) which will blend in with the homes in the area. This is especially true for the "Heritage District" Yonge to Pugsley.

The "People Plan Approach" was developed with input from residents, businesses and developers. Town staff and the public have spent a lot of time on this plan. The new official plan considers the effect on communities.

It is time to pass the new official plan and move on!!!

We have a couple of developers who care more about making money than the effect their development will have on the surrounding community.

Regards,

Lillian and Scott Thompson
104 Baker Avenue

Correspondence Item 40

From: <l.steenson@sympatico.ca>
To: <officemayor@richmondhill.ca>, <npapa@richmondhill.ca>
Date: 07/03/2010 09:57 PM
Subject: Weldrick Development

Dear Mr. Mayor:

Dear Counsellor Papa:

We are the owners and residents of 24 Weldrick Road West. We are absolutely astounded that the planners in the Town of Richmond Hill are stating that they have no plans for the west side of Yonge Street from Yongehurst to Weldrick West beyond 100 ft from Yonge. Quite a few developers have for some years been seeking to develop this area and were told "when we have our sewers updated". They have all been given to understand that this would be in or before 2012.

The developer now interested in securing the area has been working on plans since the latter part of 2008. We are astonished that only now have they been advised of the Town plans, or lack of, for Weldrick West. We have been reading recently that "building up" is preferable to "building out". It seems to make sense to balance the Weldrick/Yonge area which has Condos already established on both east and west sides.

We, and no doubt everyone else in the subject lands, have spent considerable amounts of time and money on lawyers, business managers etc. over the years and find this latest news a "bitter pill to swallow".

There is no doubt that the tax revenue from such a development (which looks really lovely on the plans) would go a long way in building the Town coffers.

Most of the homes here are older type buildings and in a few years will likely be an eyesore. Ours will most likely be a pile of rubble as it is becoming more and more difficult and expensive to maintain. New homes would definitely revitalize the area.

We ask that you use your considerable influence to have the planners reconsider the logic of their decisions and perhaps at the same time garner a few more influential votes from other members of council. However, we realize you can only do your best, and for this we sincerely thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Thomas and Hazel Steenson

July 4, 2010

BY EMAIL: officialplan@richmondhill.ca

Mayor and Members of Council
c/o Official Plan
Planning and Regulatory Services Department
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4

Dear Sir or Madame:

Re: Draft Richmond Hill Official Plan – May 6, 2010

My family and I are the property owners of 25 acres of land in the West Gormley Secondary Plan area, specifically located at 12860 Leslie Street. I am writing to express our preliminary concerns with respect to the proposed New Town of Richmond Hill Official Plan dated May 6, 2010 (the "Proposed Official Plan").

We have begun to review the draft Official Plan for the Town dated May 6, 2010 and provide the following comments for consideration.

We would request the draft Town Official Plan appropriately and specifically acknowledges that there are Decisions of the Ontario Municipal Board relating to the West Gormley Secondary Plan and that the policies within the West Gormley Secondary Plan are intended to guide the development of the lands in the area.

Accordingly we would request that Council amend the draft Town Plan to insert the following requested policy into Part 6 – Exceptions, and/or Part 7 – Interpretation of the Town Plan, in order to recognize the status of the West Gormley Secondary Plan:

> *Notwithstanding Part 1 of the Official Plan, for the lands included within the area of the West Gormley Secondary Plan, the consideration and approval of applications for subdivision, zoning or other matters pursuant to implementation of the Secondary Plan, whether such applications have been submitted or are subsequently submitted, shall be in accordance with the provisions of the West Gormley Secondary Plan.*

Such a policy would most efficiently resolve any policy issues or disconnect between the OMB-approved West Gormley Secondary Plan policies and the proposed new policies of the Town Plan.

In the absence of an explicit policy recognition for the West Gormley Secondary Plan area, there are numerous issues and inconsistencies between the proposed draft Town Plan, and the policies approved by the OMB for the West Gormley area. We wish to reiterate that many of the issues may be resolved by the incorporation of the foregoing policy within the Town Plan.

At this time we have other concerns as well, the conceptual location of the East-West Greenway Corridor and the proposed parkland dedication policy to name a few. It is our hope that the Town continue to investigate and discuss these issues further with public input prior to the adoption of any Official Town Plan.

Please provide us with notice (written or electronic) of any public meeting scheduled to consider the Plan and any decision taken by Council in connection with the Plan.

Yours truly,

Anthony Montanaro
On behalf of
Montanaro Estates Limited
39 Brantford Drive, Toronto, ON M1W 1E2
montanaro@rogers.com

Submission re: Official Plan for July 5 meeting -- Motion to defer decision
MikeTheobiz
to:
clerks
07/04/2010 09:26 PM
Cc:
officemayor, bhogg, vspatafora, gberos, awarner, cohen, lfoster, npapa, gchan, abassios
Show Details

Greetings:

I received a notice last week that council will be discussing at its July 5 meeting feedback received from residents to the latest draft of the new Official Plan for the Town of Richmond Hill.

In response to this notice, I would appreciate it if you could circulate to members of council -- including Mayor Barrow -- a copy of the document I've attached below. It is a request to defer a decision on the final plan until after the upcoming election and includes copies of some clippings I located on the *Richmond Hill Liberal's* website on issues related to the plan.

I've also provided below a copy of a January 1, 2010 submission that I emailed to a staff member (Patricia Pearsall) for consideration of council and the town's planning department. I would also like this document added to the group of documents being circulated tomorrow as I'm uncertain if it was formally presented at a council meeting earlier this year. I encourage council to review this document along with the latest draft of the Official Plan to note that many of my concerns with the draft plan have yet to be addressed.

I would appreciate it if a member from the Office of the Clerk could email me back to confirm that these documents were received and circulated to council in time for the July 5 meeting.

Thanks!

-Michael Theodores
Town of Richmond Hill resident

Michael Theodores
481 Major Mackenzie Drive East
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4C 1J3

Mayor Barrow and members of Town Council
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario L4B 3P4

Mayor Barrow and members of Council:

I've had the opportunity to review documents that the Town of Richmond Hill has placed on its website re: the development of a new Official Plan. As I have several concerns re: the current draft documents – and some suggestions that I'd like to see implemented in the final version of the plan – I've drafted this letter as part of a formal submission to the town's People Plan initiative.

First, let me say that I'm puzzled – and also troubled – to see some of the locations that have been identified as Local Development Areas (LDAs). This includes three such LDAs that are proposed on Major Mackenzie Drive East – between Bayview Ave. and just east of Bathurst.

In the case of two LDAs that are located between Bayview and Essex/Norfolk, I question the need to intensify development in this area when mid and high-density apartments/condos already exist here. I would argue that if such density existed or was planned in other parts of the town – including on Bayview Ave., on Yonge Street, north of Elgin Mills, and on Bathurst or Leslie, near large employment lands – population targets that the town is attempting to reach over the next 25 years could comfortably be attained without the need for the rampant growth that has taken place, particularly over the past decade.

I know transit – in particular, the Richmond Hill GO train – is often cited as the reason for the need to intensify in the Major Mackenzie core. However, I would counter that since no meaningful upgrades in transit have taken place in this area over the past decade or are close to being shovel ready and fully funded, such a strategy is flawed. If such thinking borders on being short-sighted and lacking a grasp of the "big picture", then why are there no:

- LDAs or Key Development Areas (KDAs) shown on Bayview – between Bayview and Highway 7 – where future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is proposed
- LDAs – and only one KDA – shown on Yonge Street between Major Mackenzie Drive and Bloomington Road, despite the fact that:
    - Viva rapid transit bus service has been in place for several years, and
    - dedicated lanes for improved bus service are proposed in the future
- LDAs – and only a single KDA – proposed between Leslie and Yonge on Carrville Road and between Yonge and 16th Ave. up to Bathurst, despite this stretch also being a planned BRT route.

In all of the areas that I've cited, there exists current strip plazas and land that would serve as excellent candidates for medium and high-density projects that could offer existing and new residents a mix of housing and retail options that could encourage short trips by car or within walking distance. In other words, the type of planning projects the town – and region and province – are advocating as part of a preferred Smart Growth approach. Prime candidates include Richmond Heights, the relatively new retail centre on Bayview (north of Highway 7), Hillcrest Mall and the large strip plaza across from Hillcrest which has yet to replace Canadian Tire.

Instead, the Major Mackenzie core – in close vicinity to my home of 30+ years, a neighbourhood I'm very familiar with – has been unjustly targeted for intensification. Considering that the protection of established neighbourhoods was one of Mayor Barrow's key platforms when he ran for Mayor in the last election, I remain extremely disappointed in the direction that town council has taken with regard to planning projects that have been reviewed over the past three years.

On the topic of the GO train – which I've been a daily rider for the past 13 years – I noticed that no LDAs or KDAs were listed in proximity to areas listed as possible expansion stations on the Richmond Hill line. This is counter to the intensification that is being recommended in the vicinity of the long-time station at Major Mackenzie Drive East and Newkirk. If the new planning approach is to intensify in close proximity to GO stations, then I expect this approach to be consistent. As the draft plan currently stands, it isn't.

Sticking to transit (you can see this is an issue I have a great interest in), I was pleased to see the City of Toronto announce just before the New Year a new policy that will require developers of new high-density projects to supply residents with a free TTC Metropass for one year. This will ensure the projects are indeed "transit supportive", a favourite selling point of developers of high-density projects, including here in Richmond Hill.

I fully support this policy and commend the City of Toronto for making this bold move. I actually requested that such a condition be included in a planning proposal for a high-density condo that I opposed at the corner of Major Mackenzie Drive East and Essex. I repeated such a request when I appeared before the Ontario Municipal Board as a participant in a hearing that was held in 2007.

Part of the reason that I suggested this condition was a concern that residents of this new high-density building would choose a car over the YRT bus or GO train, adding to the congestion woes experienced in the area. This is because the GO train is almost exclusively used by local residents commuting to and from Toronto while the spotty bus service is not seamless, compared to bus service running on either Yonge Street or Bayview.

Interestingly, in a column in the Dec. 19/09 issue of *The Toronto Star*, Stephen Dupuis – President and CEO of the Building Industry and Land Development Industry (BILD) – provided a series of arguments on why he thought this was a bad policy to introduce. Included in his rationale was his opinion that "...one-third to one-half of condo buyers will have no use for the 'free' Metropasses..."

I don't doubt Stephen's math (I think 50% is probably closer to reality and would be higher in York Region). Hence, I believe the town should proceed extremely cautiously with any intensification efforts, particularly where frequent and seamless transit is lacking, such as on the Major Mackenzie Drive East core. However, the introduction of the need to supply free YRT or GO passes would serve two great purposes:

- **directly** support either transit service (the YRT needs all the help it can get, with a cost-recovery of about 40% according to a recent Toronto Star article
- help the town gauge if the passes are in fact being used, helping to determine if these projects are indeed "transit supportive" or in fact adding to traffic congestion.

While my request for transit passes to be included as a condition of approval for the high-density project at Major Mackenzie Drive and Essex fell on deaf ears at town council – and also at the OMB hearing – I'd like to see Richmond Hill now follow Toronto's lead and include such a condition of new high-density projects in the town's new Official Plan. Tied to this initiative could also be an effort to reduce the number of parking spots in new buildings to further support the use of transit in favour of cars.

Building on what I think the new Official Plan **should** also include, here are my thoughts:

- Similar to what I've heard will be in place for the Highway 7 and Yonge Street area, I'd like to see a *phased* growth approach take place for any of the listed KDAs or LDAs. The timing of new projects would hinge on material changes to transit service. Any delays in improved service would in turn result in a delay in new projects coming on board.
- To ensure maximum participation from residents – including the opportunity to address town council personally – **all** agenda items dealing with a planning proposal would only be scheduled for evening town meetings (7:30 p.m., not 4:30 p.m.). This is based on past experiences where I had to attend several afternoon council meetings for the project that I opposed, which not only resulted in a loss of wages but also inconvenient trips from downtown Toronto to Richmond Hill.
- Improved advance notice (minimum 21-days) of council meetings scheduled to discuss new planning proposals. Not only would this allow for ample time to review all documents submitted for the meeting but it also would provide residents with sufficient time to inform neighbourhood residents of a meeting to ensure maximum participation in the planning process.
- Pre-approval of extended time for residents to address council (up to a maximum of 10 minutes) on planning proposals. Based on my past experiences at council meetings, residents are often restricted to just five minutes to address council, which is insufficient in my opinion to properly capture all issues of concern.
- Improved access to electronic documents (such as .pdf's) in a planning file, free of charge. This is based on past experiences where it was necessary to visit the town's head office and pay for photocopies of some key documents in the file.
- Improved notification – using the town's website – of any new planning proposals that are filed with the town. Residents often are unaware of a new proposal until they receive notification via mail, which sets them at a disadvantage.

While the concept of the People Plan sounds noble and I realize a lot of work has been conducted by a variety of staff on the current draft documents that have been developed to date, I hope that the comments – and suggestions – in my submission are given a thorough review. As it stands, I see a lot of issues – and flaws – in the draft documents that need to be addressed to ensure the new Official Plan in fact reflects the input of the people.

Sincerely,

Michael Theodores

Michael Theodores
481 Major Mackenzie Drive East
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4C 1J3
Sunday, July 4, 2010

Mayor Barrow and members of Town Council
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario L4B 3P4

Mayor Barrow and members of Council:

I'm writing in re: to a council meeting scheduled for Monday, July 5, 2010 to discuss the latest staff report on the development of a new Official Plan for the Town of Richmond Hill.

Noting my concerns with gaps in the last draft completed in May 2010 – along with the tight timeframe council has had to review feedback provided by residents and stakeholders at a June 9 meeting – **I strongly urge council to defer a decision on a new Official Plan until after the election on October 25, 2010.**

It's my opinion that work on the revised plan still requires additional effort to address concerns that residents such as myself have been expressed since the initial call for input. Further to this, I noted with interest in an article in the July 1 issue of the *Richmond Hill Liberal* (see attached documents) that an updated report by Metrolinx on some key transit projects – including material upgrades to Richmond Hill GO train service – will not be available until later this year.

In the case of the Richmond Hill GO train, the article confirmed that funding for all-day service – and two new Richmond Hill stations that would drive improved frequency on this line – remain under review and unfunded. Yet, the latest draft of the Richmond Hill Official Plan carries proposed new intensification targets in the vicinity of the station – and on the Major Mackenzie Drive East core – that make such improvements to service seem a certainty.

As you know, I have made several submissions to the town over the past five years about my concerns with the level of intensification being supported on the Major Mackenzie Drive East core due to the service provided by the Richmond Hill GO train. Through my experience with a neighbourhood high-density planning proposal that was approved by council, both council and planning staff seem to have a *build the new project and the improved transit will come* approach. Yet, over the past five years – as per past concerns that I've raised with council and town staff – **no material upgrades are in place or have been secured for the future.**

While council – dating back to Mayor Bill Bell's final term – have made public statements about advocating for improved all-day Richmond Hill GO train service, it's clear this position has little sway with the higher authorities who decide which transit projects receive shovel-ready funding. As we stand here in July 2010, local riders continue to have to be satisfied with only limited weekday service (four southbound morning runs, five northbound in the afternoon/evening) in half-hour intervals.

While I understand that deferring a decision on the new Official Plan until after the upcoming election may not provide increased clarity on transit projects that will better serve the town in the future, I think this is a chance worth taking. As improved transit is a centrepiece in the new Official Plan, I think it's imperative that council – and the residents of Richmond Hill – have full confidence that improved transit will be in place as more aggressive projects are approved and come on board.

In the meantime, I think the town should continue to welcome feedback and suggestions on the latest draft. My review of parts of the sizable draft dated May 2010 detected numerous gaps and weaknesses that I think merit further discussion. I'd be happy to share these concerns and suggestions in an additional submission during the summer.

On a final note, I would once again like to express my concern with the town's lack of timely notification of a major meeting such as the one scheduled for Monday, July 5, 2010. I received an email from the town on the afternoon of June 30 – the day before a public holiday – for this meeting. This allowed little time to properly review staff comments on submissions that were received at the June 9 meeting. I'm sure some council members encountered a similar challenge.

Such short notice of a major meeting – wrapped around a holiday – has occurred several times in the past for meetings I've had an interest in commenting on or attending. I think the 4:30 p.m. meeting time – rather than an evening session – is a further inconvenience for residents who are unable to attend meetings during working hours. When the town puts the final touches on the new Official Plan, I hope that timely notification – along with increased flexibility for the time limits for addressing council at meetings – is also captured. **I feel the current by-laws in place are inadequate.**

I hope council takes this latest feedback into consideration at the July 5 meeting and supports my motion to defer a decision on the town's New Official Plan until the fall of 2010 or early in 2011.

Sincerely,

Michael Theodores
Town of Richmond Hill resident

Copies of recent Richmond Hill Liberal articles on development of new Official Plan for Richmond Hill

BY ADAM MC LEAN
Jul 02, 2010 - 3:38 PM

Official Plan could be endorsed Monday

The Town of Richmond Hill's new official plan will once again go before councillors Monday afternoon.

The draft document which outlines where development will take place and guides the over-all look and feel of the town for the next 20 years was the subject of a town open forum last month, capping off more than two years of public input.

Both negative and positive reviews were expressed by residents and landowners, with more than 40 delegates speaking in person and another 70 pieces of written correspondence submitted.

So great was the volume of public opinion, rather than set July 5 as the deadline for council to endorse or reject the 282-page manual, councillors instead opened a window to the possibility of continued analysis over the summer or even beyond the Oct. 25 municipal election, if more time is necessary following Monday's meeting.

That meeting will be held in town council chambers at 225 East Beaver Creek Rd. and will beginning at 4:30 p.m.

While important for the town's future, the official plan is but one of many agenda items, so other issues will be discussed also.

If you would like to appear before council about this or any other agenda item, you must notify the town clerk at clerks@richmondhill.ca or by calling 905-771-8800 before noon, July 5.

Each speaker must adhere to a five-minute maximum.

To view the July 5 committee of the whole agenda visit the town website at www.richmondhill.ca. Go to the Council tab and then click on the Meetings and Agendas tab.

For more information on the town's official plan visit www.richmondhill.ca/draftOP

By David Fleischer
Jun 30, 2010 - 8:25 AM

Metrolinx to prioritize 7 projects

Metrolinx is also studying the capital needs of expanding the system to all-day, two-way service over a decade. Some of the unfunded projects on that list include:
- **12-car trains on the Richmond Hill, Stouffville and Barrie lines**
- **Shoulder peak trains on the Barrie and Stouffville lines**
- **A layover track and two new stations on the Richmond Hill line**
- **Double-tracking all three lines and building a grade separation at Doncaster Road**
- **Adding a new platform and extending others at Union Station**

There still isn't any funding for the Yonge subway extension, but, by the fall, you will at least know where the project ranks as a priority for Metrolinx.

The regional transit authority approved a framework Tuesday that will prioritize seven big-ticket transit projects, including in-limbo plans to extend the subway from Finch Station to Hwy. 7.

A draft prioritization is expected between August and October, with a final report coming before the board in November. But don't expect the equivalent of a Top 10 countdown, Metrolinx CEO Rob Prichard said. Rather, the agency will offer its expert advice to the province, putting the projects into prioritized groups.

"Ultimately, the decision as to which projects proceed will be a provincial decision," Mr. Prichard said. Metrolinx's $50-billion transit plan, The Big Move, prioritized 15 projects, but only came with about $10 billion to spend.

Three of those are fully funded and a further five, including Viva's bus lanes, are receiving money that will be phased until 2020.

The subway, with a budget estimated at $2.4 billion, is among seven projects for which there is no money. Their total budget is estimated at just less than $16 billion.

Others on the list include express rail along GO's Lakeshore line and rapid transit in Durham Region. "It's an extremely challenging task," Mr. Prichard said of figuring out who will get whatever scarce funding might pop up.

Further complicating matters for the subway are caveats attached by the TTC to the extension, including improvements to the Bloor-Yonge station and prioritizing the "downtown relief line," a new subway to take stress of the Yonge-University line.

The Yonge plans also include automated signals that will improve capacity by allowing trains to run more often and closer to one another.

Metrolinx staff has prepared benefit case analyses of all the funded projects that will be a big part of the analyses.

The report on the subway, released last summer, touted the superior environmental, economic, land development and community impacts of a subway.

The framework approved by Metrolinx's board Tuesday will evaluate the analyses, review them and solicit stakeholder input in relation to their delivery, constructability and strategic fit.

Like everyone else, York Region hopes its project will come out high on the list and officials will not sit on the sidelines in the coming months.

"We continue to work with all levels of government to secure funding," Viva spokesperson Dale Albers said.

"Discussions will continue even as the priority framework evolves over the summer."
The final decision may be political, but Metrolinx can offer advice in terms of the goals of the Big Move and improving congestion and tranporation across the entire Greater Toronto Area and Hamilton region, Mr. Prichard said.

Metrolinx will release an investment strategy by 2013 that will outline scenarios for generating long-term funding for transit.

By Adam Mc Lean
Jun 10, 2010 - 1:34 PM

Richmond Hill won't rush official plan

Considering, it's been 28 years since Richmond Hill's last official plan, many councillors said they won't be rushed and don't want their upcoming summer break or October's municipal election to influence their final recommendations on the growth plan.

This message came out of last night's overflow public meeting in council chambers, when town staff presented their draft Richmond Hill official plan and 41 delegates offered their thoughts on the plan.

Staff received comments from Wednesday night's 41 speakers, along with the 75 pieces of written correspondence on the plan and intended to present those findings to council for their final recommendations July 5.

To approve something that has taken the work of many people and will influence the town for a long time shouldn't be passed in such haste, said Ward 3 Councillor David Cohen.

"I have not yet been able to comment or address the people we heard here tonight and without further debate on July 5, I find it hard to believe that these people are being listened to," Mr. Cohen stated before a packed council chamber and residents watching and listening in an overflow room next door.

Many of his fellows council members agreed and pledged to respectfully give the official plan appropriate discussion time even if that means final recommendations don't come until after the Oct. 25 election.

The draft official plan's 272 pages serve as a guide to the future growth and intensification of Richmond Hill and "building a new kind of urban".

The plan also formulates necessary dimensions and regulations for required green space in new development, designates specific ares as to density allotment and also prescribes restrictions to the type of dwellings that can be placed in particular town corridors.

The draft is the result of three years spent consulting with residents and local business owners through open forums, lectures and round table discussions, to gauge what residents envision as an ideal Richmond Hill, 25 years from now.

In addition to public input, the town still must adhere to certain provincial and regional intensification policies.

The 41 individuals who spoke last night represented a mixed bag of just who this plan will impact.

Not only were residents on hand to express concern or, in some cases, contentment, but so too were many contractors, lawyers and consultants who spoke on specific density or development restrictions that could affect their clients.

The David Dunlap Observatory supporters were also well represented with 10 of the speakers commenting on what they view as the official plan failure to protect the 190 acres of green space that was formerly owned by the University of Toronto.

To view a digital copy of the draft official plan, visit www.richmondhill.ca/draftOP

Correspondence Item 43

CATTANACH HINDSON SUTTON VANVELDHUIZEN LLP
Barristers and Solicitors

J.Lachlan Cattanach, Q.C.
Lawrence R.S. Sutton, Q.C.
John R. Carruthers, B.A., LL.B.

Donald C. Hindson, B.A., LL.B., Q.C.
Albert J. VanVeldhuizen, B.A., LL.B.
Terrence A. Pochmurski, B.A., LL.B.

52 Main Street Markham North
Markham, Ontario, Canada
L3P 1X5

Telephone (905) 294-0666 Ext. 230
Facsimile (905) 294-5688

July 05, 2010

Sent via fax: 905-771-2502

TOWN CLERK
THE TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4

Attention: Ms. Donna L. McLarty

Dear Ms. McLarty:

RE: Richmond Hill Official Plan, Staff Report (SRPRS.10.081)
Our File No.: 29913

Ms. Maria Gatzios of Gatzios Planning has asked me to write to you and to note that the submissions with respect to 386, 396 and 400 Highway #7 East as set out in Ms. Gatzios' letter of June 8, 2010 have not been addressed in the Committee of the Whole Report dated July 5, 2010.

For your convenience I am enclosing a copy of the June 8, 2010 letter and we would appreciate any reconsideration of the submissions contained therein in your final redraft.

Yours very truly,

CATTANACH HINDSON SUTTON VanVELDHUIZEN LLP

Donald C. Hindson, Q.C.
DCH:lf

cc: Maria Gatzios
Joanne Barnett
Marion Psotta

Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.

File No: 65RH-1020

June 8, 2010

Town Clerk
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4B 3P4

Attention: Ms. Donna L. McLarty, Town Clerk

Regarding: COMMENTS REGARDING THE MAY 6, 2010 PROPOSED NEW OFFICIAL PLAN THE AU FISCH CORPORATION PROPERTY 386, 396 & 400 HIGHWAY No. 7 EAST

Dear Ms. McLarty:

I am writing as the planning consultant to the owner of the above-noted three parcels.

In total, the three properties are approximately 4.7 acres (1.9 hectares) of undeveloped land located on the north side of Highway No. 7 between Valleymede Drive and Rockwell Road, generally between Leslie Street and Bayview Avenue.

We have reviewed the May 6, 2010 draft of the Town's new Official Plan, and note that the properties are designated as 'Regional Mixed Use Corridor', located on the north side of the Highway No. 7 'Regional Corridor'.

We offer the following comments and concerns for the Town's consideration regarding two main issues we have identified with the draft new Official Plan:

ISSUE 1: MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT

Policy:

Part 3. of the OP contains subsection 3.1.9 Servicing Our Community, with clause 3.1.9.8 Buttonville Airport containing policy 2 regarding the height of buildings and structures. Policy 2. indicates that the height of buildings and structures be restricted in accordance with the Federal Zoning Regulations for Buttonville Airport in order to ensure a satisfactory level of safety for lands located on the approach paths to the Buttonville Airport **for as long as the Buttonville Airport continues in operation** (bold emphasis added).

7270 Woodbine Avenue, Suite 302
Markham, Ontario
L3R 4B9

gatziosplanning.com
t 905.475.9191
f 905.475.8346

Part 4. of the OP contains section 4.6 Regional Mixed Use Corridors, and subsection 4.6.1 Land Use contains Policy 7 regarding lands on Highway 7. Policy 7, clause c) indicates a maximum building height of 11 storeys.

Comment:

Clause 3.1.9.8 provides the context for building height restrictions – the existence of Buttonville Airport and the associated Federal Zoning Regulations, however, it also provides that heights are to be restricted 'for as long as the Buttonville Airport continues in operation'.

Clause 4.6.1 imposes height restriction of 11 storeys, but does not provide any option for alternative heights in the event that the Buttonville Airport ceases operation. Other Regional Mixed Use Corridor policies indicate a maximum height of 15 storeys, such as policies 6. and 9.

We suggest that Clause 4.6.1, policy 7.c. should be revised to read as follows:

> **"A minimum building height of 11 storeys, which can be increased to 15 storeys without amendment to this Plan, in the event that the Buttonville Airport ceases operation; ..."**

ISSUE 2: DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Policy:

Parts 3. and 4. of the OP contain various sections which determine the built form and the development potential for this property. In summary, we note:

Part 3, subsection 3.4.1. Urban Design – Transition to Neighbourhoods policies:

- policy 55: development within the centres and corridors shall provide:
  a) max 45 degree angular view plane projected from the adjacent low density residential property line
- policy 58: buildings greater than 8 storeys shall provide min 25m tower separation
- policy 59: buildings greater than 8 storeys shall have max 750 sq.m. floor plate
- policy 60: mid-rise and high-rise buildings shall have a min 3 metre step back of the building above the base building height as per Chapter 4 policies

Part 4, subsection 4.6.1. Land Use policies:

- policy 5: max site density on Highway 7 shall be 2.5 FSI
- policy 7: lands on Highway 7:
  a) minimum building height of 3 storeys

b) max base building height of 4 storeys
c) max building height of 11 storeys
d) tallest buildings shall be directed to the Highway 7 frontage

- policy 12: development abutting the Neighbourhood designation shall have max height of 3 storeys, building heights may progressively increase away from lands within the Neighbourhood designation

Comment:

Taken together, the policies of subsections 3.4.1 and 4.6.1 set out the site design parameters and determine the development potential of the property. We note that in combination, the restrictions in these policies create a design context which makes achievement of the property's full development potential impossible.

We note that the approved development scheme for the Liberty Development site immediately adjacent to this property provides for an FSI of 2.5 to 3.0, depending on how it is measured, and that the tower floor plates are well in excess of 750 sq.m. each, allowing the site to achieve it's full development potential. This development does not meet the restrictions being proposed in the draft new OP, however it was just approved as good planning by the Town.

We request that staff reconsider the restrictions in these two sections of the draft OP, most importantly the cumulative result of the minimum tower separation of 25 metres, the minimum floor plate of 750 sq.m., the maximum building height of 11m, and the maximum FSI of 2.5.

In conclusion, we appreciate the Town's consideration of our comments and concerns, and we would be available to discuss these matters at staff's convenience. We may, upon further review of this version and/or additional iterations of the Town's draft new Official Plan, have additional or further comments and concerns which we reserve the right to submit as appropriate.

Sincerely,

Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.

Maria Gatzios, MCIP RPP

Copy to: The Au Fisch Corporation
Ms. Joanne Barnett
Mr. Donald Hindson

Correspondence Item 44

Commercial Focus Advisory Services Inc.

35 The Links Road, Suite 202. Toronto, ON M2P 1T7

Tel: 416 907-8109 Fax: 416 972-9588

E Mail: Stephen@commercialfocusadvisoryservices.ca

July 5, 2010

Mayor Dave Barrow and Council
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ont. L4C 4Y5

Delivered by E Mail and Surface Mail to the Town Clerk Donna L. McLarty

Dear Mr. Mayor and Council

RE: Draft Richmond Hill Official Plan Committee of the Whole , Submission on Behalf of the Owners of 10731 Yonge St., 39,41 Elgin Mills East, and 10720 Yonge Street.

We respectfully request that the Committee of the Whole defer dealing with this matter on July 5, 2010, in order to afford landowners reasonable opportunity to evaluate the implications of the staff report. The request is reasonable for the following reasons:

1. The 72 page staff report of the summary of comments received on the Draft OP and comments to those are very comprehensive, and require significant review in terms of implications.

2. The report was not available until June 30, 2010 after 3 pm. With the long weekend, it was not possible for landowners to fully evaluate the content of the very comprehensive staff report, and to fully consider the changes proposed.

3. Staff have been working on "People Plan Richmond Hill" since 2007, and to release a lengthy staff report before a long weekend and asking for comments on such a restricted time frame appears to be contrary to the process and intent outlined in the Planning Act.

4. The staff report states that this Plan will proactively shape and guide future growth, and development and management of resources over the next 25 years. Within this time frame, a short deferral of this item is not unreasonable, and reflects good planning.

We look forward to the Committee of the Whole responding to our request and affording landowners reasonable opportunity to evaluate and respond to the staff report of June 30, 2010.

Yours Sincerely,

Stephen I. Fagyas, M.A., M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Commercial Focus Advisory Services

C.c. Ana Bassios, Commissioner of Planning and Development

RE: Town of Richmond Hill Notice - Proposed New Official Plan - July 5, 2010 Committee of the Whole Meeting

Frank Shostack to: clerks 07/05/2010 11:50 AM

Cc: harsenault, Azkerekes

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

Further to my earlier e-mail of June 25, requesting that my name be included on the speakers list for this evening's meeting, I have reviewed the Staff Report and advise, on behalf of Feldbar Holdings Limited and S & E Consultants Limited, the owners of the property located on South West corner of Yonge Street and Canyon Hill Road, that we support the recommendations contained in the Staff Report. Accordingly, it will not be necessary for us to speak to the Committee at this evening's meeting and we therefore ask that our name(s) be removed from the list of speakers.

Frank Shostack

Black|Sutherland LLP
Barristers & Solicitors * Trademark Agents

Direct Phone: (416)840-1343
E-mail: fshostack@blacksutherland.com
www.blacksutherland.com

BRATTY AND PARTNERS, LLP
BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

Correspondence Item 46

PLEASE REFER TO:
Barry Horosko (Ext: 339)
Email: bhorosko@bratty.com
Assistant: Nathan Muscat (Ext: 263)
Email: nmuscat@bratty.com
Telephone: (905)760-2700

July 5, 2010

Town of Richmond Hill
Office of the Clerk
225 East Beaver Creek Road
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4B 3P4

Attention: Donna McLarty
Town Clerk

Dear Ms. McLarty:

Re: Town of Richmond Hill
Draft Official Plan Committee of the Whole Meeting of July 5, 2010
Part of Lots 31 & 32, Plan 2607
5, 9 & 15 Rockwell Road and 372, 276 & 382 Highway 7

We act as legal counsel to 1612072 Ontario Inc. c/o Liberty Development Corporation with respect to the above referenced matter.

Parkland Policies

Further to our letter dated June 4, 2010, we have been requested to follow up on the following matter. We are writing to express concerns that the parkland dedication requirements contained in the Official Plan operate to discourage higher density residential units. The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the draft Richmond Hill Official Plan appear to encourage increased densities. This is ironically in conflict with the Richmond Hill parkland requirement of one (1) hectare of land for every 300 residential units.

For example, a development at five (5) times density generates a parkland requirement in excess of the original size of the development parcel. This parkland policy can result in an absurd result and deserves more analysis. It is our submission that a more balanced approach should be provided in the new draft Official Plan with respect to overall parkland dedication requirements.

Exterior and Sustainable Design Elements

We are also writing to express concerns with the new proposed policy in section 5.14.3 of the draft Official Plan with respect to Council's powers of regulating exterior design and sustainable design elements. There are potential very broad powers and no guidelines or parameters for consideration and use have been provided. It is our submission that this policy should include such provisions.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, we invite you to contact the undersigned. Please advise us as this matter proceeds.

Yours truly,
BRATTY AND PARTNERS, LLP

Barry A. Horosko

cc: Marco Filice, Liberty Development Corporation

HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.

July 5, 2010
HPGI File: 09215

Clerks Department
Town of Richmond Hill
225 East Beaver Creek Road
PO Box 300
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4C 4Y5

Attn: Mayor and Members of Council

Re: Town of Richmond Hill Draft Official Plan (SRPRS.10.081)
Committee of Whole Meeting July 5, 2010
File No. D10-C0-IN, D10-OP-DR

On behalf of Westgrant Investments Limited, the owner of lands located at 60 Granton Drive also legally described as Part Block 3, 65M-2227, Part 1 65R-9569, Humphries Planning Group Inc. is providing comments to the draft official plan. The subject land is currently designated as "High Performance Industrial" within the OPA 1, the Beaver Creek Business Park Secondary Plan.

On November 9, 2009 an application was submitted to the Town of Richmond Hill requesting Zoning By-law Amendment to permit the continuation of a Health Centre currently operating within Units 1-4 of Building A at the above noted property. The total area of use is 1110m2.

We have now had the opportunity to review the proposed draft Official Plan and note that Section 4.8.1.1 3 c) proposes to include fitness clubs as a permitted secondary use for the subject land with a limitation or restriction placed on maximum floor space of 500m2 per building. We note that there are two buildings on this property and the health club is the only secondary use occurring on the premises.

We are requesting that a site specific exception be provided within the Official Plan for this location which acknowledges the area of the existing health club of 1110m2 and restricts such ancillary use only to Building "B". This request is being made on the basis of maintaining the intent of the proposed official plan as 1000m2 of ancilliary space would be permitted on the overall site.

..../2

216 Chrislea Road
Suite 103
Vaughan, ON
L4L 8S5

T: 905-264-7678
F: 905-264-8073

www.humphriesplanning.com

We would be pleased to meet with staff to further discuss this matter at its earliest opportunity.

Yours truly,
HUMPHPRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.

Rosemarie L. Humphries BA,MCIP, RPP
President

cc. Westgrant Investments Limited