

Development Services Public Meeting Minutes

Meeting Number: 4
March 10, 2026, 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM
Live streamed

Roll Call	Deputy Mayor Michael Chan Regional Councillor Jim Jones Regional Councillor Alan Ho Councillor Keith Irish Councillor Ritch Lau	Councillor Karen Rea Councillor Amanda Collucci Councillor Nimisha Patel Councillor Isa Lee
Regrets	Mayor Frank Scarpitti Regional Councillor Joe Li	Councillor Reid McAlpine Councillor Andrew Keyes
Staff	Trinela Cane, Commissioner, Corporate Services Stephen Lue, Senior Manager, Development Rick Cefaratti, Acting Manager, West District Aaron Chau, Planner I	Stacia Muradali, Manager, Development - East Laura Gold, Council/Committee Coordinator Jennifer Kim, Senior Planner

Alternate formats for this document are available upon request

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Development Services Public Meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM with Regional Councillor Jim Jones in the Chair.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There was no disclosure of pecuniary interest.

3. DEPUTATIONS

Deputations were heard with the respective item.

4. REPORTS

4.1 PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION REPORT, TANYA HOLME-STRADER AT 171 MAIN STREET MARKHAM NORTH, APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO ADD A BUSINESS OFFICE USE TO THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL ZONE (WARD 4), FILE NO. PLAN 25 14433 (10.5)

The Public Meeting this date was to consider an application submitted by Tanya Holme-Strade.

The Committee Clerk advised that 156 notices were mailed on February 18, 2026, and a Public Meeting sign was posted on January 22, 2026. There was one written submission received regarding this proposal.

Aaron Chau, Senior Planner, gave a presentation regarding the proposal, the location, surrounding uses and outstanding issues.

Joanna Fast, Groundwell Urban Planners, provided a presentation on the proposal.

There were no comments from the audience or Committee with respect to this application.

Committee requested that the application be sent directly to Council.

Moved by Councillor Karen Rea

Seconded by Councillor Nimisha Patel

1. **That the written submission by Louise McGill be received.**
2. That the report for the Zoning By-law Amendment Application submitted by Tanya Holme-Strader (the ‘Owner’) which “proposes to add a business office use to the existing residential zone”, Ward 4 File No. PLAN 25 144333, be received; and,
3. That the Record of the Public Meeting held on March 10th, 2026, with respect to Zoning By-law Amendment Application (File No. PLAN 25 144333), be received; and,
4. That the Application submitted by Tanya Holme-Strader (the “Owner”) for the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. PLAN 25 144333), be approved at a future Council meeting without further Notice; and further,
5. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this Resolution.

Carried

4.2 PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION REPORT, SHATSFORD DEVELOPMENTS INC. AT 8432 AND 8500 LESLIE STREET AND 220 COMMERCE VALLEY DRIVE WEST, APPLICATIONS FOR OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

TO PERMIT A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF FOUR BUILDINGS BETWEEN 9 AND 42 STOREYS WITH 1,183 RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS, COMMERCIAL USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR, AND A NEW PUBLIC ROAD (WARD 8), FILE NO. PLAN 25 141723 (10.3, 10.5)

The Public Meeting this date was to consider an application submitted by Shatsford Developments Inc.

The Committee Clerk advised that a total of 4,230 notices were mailed to Markham landowners within the 1,000-metre vicinity of the subject lands on February 18, 2026. In addition, notices were mailed to landowners in the City of Richmond Hill within the same 1,000-metre radius, including 272 notices to landowners within the 200-metre vicinity on February 27, 2026, and a further 2,984 notices to landowners within the remaining 800-metre vicinity on March 5 and March 6, 2026. The Public Meeting notice sign decal was posted on February 13, 2026.

There were 15 written submissions received regarding this proposal.

Jennifer Kim, Senior Planner, gave a presentation regarding the proposal, the location, surrounding uses and outstanding issues.

Timothy Schilling, KLM Planning Partners Inc., presented on behalf of the Applicant.

The following deputations on the development application were made:

- **Azi Razbani**

Azi Razbani registered to speak at the meeting.

- **Kay Chan – Leitchcroft Community Association**

Kay Chan, spoke on behalf of the Leitchcroft Community Association, providing the following feedback:

- Wanted confirmation that rezoning only applies to this phase of the development.
- Asked whether separate rezoning would be needed later if the existing office buildings are redeveloped.
- Warned that future redevelopment of the remaining lands could make the current supporting analysis incomplete or outdated.

- Expressed concern of that apparent trend to rezone commercial sites to residential sites.
- Credited the applicant for proposing a mix of heights, which may fit the area better than an all-tall-tower approach, but felt the development could still be better integrated with the community.
- Stressed that the area spans two municipalities—Markham and Richmond Hill—and should be planned more collaboratively. Expressing concern that both cities may be approving high-density residential growth independently, without accounting for the combined population increase.
- Argued that the area lacks adequate parks, recreational spaces, and community centres, noting that the closest community centre is inconveniently far away by transit.
- Identified traffic as the biggest local concern, especially on Highway 7.
- Questioned the low parking ratio and whether it realistically reflects a still car dependent area.

- **Tatyana Tyomkin**

Tatyana Tyomkin, local resident, spoke in opposition of the development for the following reasons:

- Severe Leslie Street traffic congestion, and lack of road widening on Leslie Street to support new development in the area.
- Concern over introducing a new road and traffic signals.
- Incompatibility of adding more people to an area that is a business district.
- Lack of green space in the area to support new development.

- **Dan Quinto – Local Resident**

Dan Quinto, a long-time resident, strongly opposed the scale of the proposal, expressing the following concerns:

- The proposal was described as excessive and out of scale with the area.
- A 42-storey building along Highway 7 was seen as an eyesore, noting that the closure of the Buttonville Airport does not mean that very tall building should be built in this location.
- Highway 7 is already heavily congested and no longer functions like a “highway”.
- Raised cyclist and pedestrian safety concerns.

- Questioned where overflow parking would go, given low parking ratio.
- Worried that the tower height would create privacy impacts, with new residents looking directly into nearby backyards.
- Asked whether the buildings would be rental or ownership.
- Expressed concern about the implications of large rental buildings.

- **Judith Armils, German Mills Residents Association**

Judith Amoils, representing the German Mills Residents Association, said her community is concerned about the cumulative density being proposed along Leslie Street, expressing the following concerns regarding the proposal:

- Numerous redevelopment proposals are emerging along the corridor, including: the Sheraton Hotel site, this application, 2300 John Street, and the Shoppes on Steeles site.
- The area lacks parks, community centres, and school capacity (specifically noting that St. Robert Catholic High School already uses portables).
- Wanted more clarity on what is planned for the Le Parc site.
- Highlighted that congestion on Highway 7 often spills onto John Street, affecting nearby neighbourhoods.
- Urged Council to assess this proposal in relation to the total density proposed in the larger area, not in isolation.

- **Heidi Luchen-Scott and Mike Scott – Local Residents**

Heidi Luchen-Scott and Mike Scott opposed the development proposal for the following reasons:

Heidi Luchen-Scott's Points

- Believes the site is better suited to commercial use, consistent with current zoning.
- Argued there are insufficient schools for additional population.
- Said 1,100+ units would place unsustainable pressure on area services.
- Suggested a more moderate building form, such as mid-rise development, would fit better.

- Warned that permitting towers like this would create a “condo alley” along Highway 7.
- Argued infrastructure should come before density, not after.
- Questioned how the development benefits long-time local residents.
- Raised traffic concerns.

Mike Scott's Points:

- Called the project excessive for this location.
- Said this level of density is more appropriate around places with higher-order transit, like Vaughan Metropolitan Centre or the Yonge subway corridor.
- Reiterated traffic concerns on Leslie Street and John Street.
- Said placing such a large share of new rental housing in one tower seemed unreasonable.

Together, they argued for a more comprehensive, infrastructure-led planning approach be taken when reviewing the application.

The Committee provided the following feedback on the development proposal:

- Noted that purpose-built rentals are beneficial because they are managed by one property manager, rather than many individual landlords and that rental housing should not be stigmatized as it is an important part of the housing system.
- Questioned whether any of the proposed units would be affordable housing or purpose-built rentals.
- Questioned if there would be any park/green space, and if the amount would be enough for a development of this scale.
- Some of the Councillors expressed concern that the site is being converted from employment to residential.
- Noted traffic will need to be reviewed both by the City of Markham and York Region.
- Suggested school capacity is a concern, especially if students are being sent to schools outside of the area.
- Noted the area lacks basic amenities and greenspace, which presents the risk that the development will become an isolated residential island surrounded by employment.
- Noted Markham already has roughly 184,000–200,000 approved units that have not yet been built and that it would take around 80 years to build out the current inventory (based on 2,500 units per year being built), which represents many decades of supply. Questioning, if Council should continue to approve new units

without looking at the bigger picture of market absorption, infrastructure, and long-term planning capacity.

- Noted that the intersection of Highway 7 and Leslie Street is undergoing major change on multiple corners, and that City should understand what is happening on all four corners so that applications can be looked at more comprehensively.
- A suggestion was made to form a Working Group or hold a Thornhill Sub-Committee meeting to discuss the application, but Committee decided against this in the end.

The following responses to inquiries from the Public and Committee were provided:

Traffic and Park Land

Staff advised will take back the comments—particularly concerning traffic and parkland and discuss it with the Applicant.

The Applicant advised that there is no park currently proposed at this time, but that there are plans to have amenity space between the buildings. Discussions on parkland and amenity space are still underway.

Site and Application Clarification

Staff clarified that redevelopment shown is only for the lands north of the proposed public road and that the southern half of the property will be introduced at another time. Staff further clarified that the two office buildings will remain, and that former Le Parc Banquet Hall will be demolished.

Affordable Units and Unit Mix

The Applicant advised that there are currently no proposed affordable units at this time, and that the unit tenure (rental versus condo) has yet to be confirmed. The mix of units sizes (1,2-, or 3-bedroom units) is also still being discussed with staff.

Committee referred that application back to Staff.

Moved by Councillor Isa Lee

Seconded by Councillor Nimisha Patel

Suggest Draft Resolutions for Consideration of the Development Services Committee:

- 1. That the written submissions by Kam Kerachi, Dr. Fatima Ahmed, Mark Mok Yi, Mei Kuen Wong, Jessica Wong, Vincent Ching, Laurie Lee, Lily Cheung, Thomas Chang, Kenny Kwan, Kay Chan of Leitchcroft Community Association, Lina Cornacchia and Frank**

Melino, Valerie Zhang, Hillson Leung, and Allen Quin, be received; and,

- 2. That the deputations by Azi Razbani, Kay Chan of Leitchcroft Community Association, Tatyana Tyomkin, Don Quintos, Judith Armils of German Mills Residents Association, and Heidi Luchen-Scott and Mike Scott, be received; and,**
3. That the report entitled “PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION REPORT, SHATSFORD DEVELOPMENTS INC. Applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a mixed-use development consisting of four buildings between 9 and 42 storeys with 1,183 residential dwelling units, commercial uses on the ground floor, and a new public road at 8432 and 8500 Leslie Street and 220 Commerce Valley Drive West File Number PLAN 25 141723” be received; and,
4. That the Record of the Public Meeting held on March 10, 2026 with respect to the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications, be received; and,
5. That the applications by Shatsford Developments Inc. for a proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (PLAN 25 141723), be referred back to staff for a report and a recommendation; and further,
6. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Development Services Public Meeting adjourned at 8:32 PM.