

**Subject:** Deputation regarding By-law amendment proposal (May 25 DSC)

**From:** Ian Free  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 12:57 PM  
**To:** Clerks Public <[clerkspublic@markham.ca](mailto:clerkspublic@markham.ca)>  
**Subject:** Deputation regarding By-law amendment proposal

**CAUTION:** This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello;

I would like to make both a written and virtual deputation before the DSC on the following topic scheduled for the May 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

On the topic of:

10.2 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT PROCEDURAL BY-LAW

AMENDMENT REPORT FILE #: PR 20 112899 (10.12)

The following is my deputation:

RE: Proposal to enact a bylaw to allow COA meetings be held differently.

I object to the proposal without consideration of the following:

- 1) Notice by mail to land owners near the property is a must. The newspaper delivery system in our area is spotty at best with several missed deliveries regularly per quarter. Handing the delivery of notices to an unreliable third party does not meet the intent of the bylaw.
- 2) The only way the resident would get the information that goes along with that variance request is by downloading it from the city website which most people will not bother with.
- 3) The democratic right of objectors will be extremely weakened by not allowing a face to face interaction with the COA members.
- 4) The meetings being held only electronically will remove to many citizens from having their voices heard even if it just in person for support of an objector.
- 5) Having objections heard through email or letter may not allow the committee to hear any feedback from residents on changes being made after the letter of objection.
- 6) If a resident does not receive a mailout or read the notice in the paper, a sign may not even be seen as it might be on a different street that they do not frequent.
- 7) Getting permission from the city in advance for deputations is not going to work. Without live streaming and an ability to interact with the committee, the applicant will have a strong advantage which is also not the intent of the committee sitting at all.
- 8) A lot of the detail of the application might be lost due to technology issues, as in person viewing of detail is much preferred and more questions get asked by the public at large.
- 9) This is only a temporary measure while the provincial government is under ‘emergency order’. This order may be removed before the committee normally sits in September and would make this process redundant. It would be better to wait and see if the ‘emergency order’ remains in place that long at that any changes are tied to that ‘emergency order’ only!
- 10) There is no variance request for infill housing or construction that could not wait until the order is lifted. Only emergency matters should come before any committee that is struck during the lockdown.
- 11) Signage currently does not get updated when there is deferral to include any new dates and any new information. This would have to be closely monitored by the city.
- 12) Written hearings should NEVER happen as they take the public out of the equation for the most part.
- 13) And MOST importantly, one of the tests is “Is it in the publics’ interest”. How can we guarantee that the public has their say? Many of the attendees are usually seniors that lack the skills to get the information on-line or participate in an on-line discussion or deputation.

I believe that this may get out of hand and give developers of in-fill housing the upper hand when it comes to variance requests and therefore should NOT be allowed to happen without careful consideration. The process to have your say is becoming to arduous a task for a lot of people and the meetings will occur after hours where no city help is available.

Respectfully;

Ian Free

**Subject:** Meeting May25 deputation request Regarding Bylaw amendment to COA process

**From:** Chris Bergauer-Free

**Sent:** Friday, May 22, 2020 4:28 PM

**To:** Clerks Public <[clerkspublic@markham.ca](mailto:clerkspublic@markham.ca)>

**Subject:** Meeting May25 deputation request Regarding Bylaw amendment to COA process

**CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Below is my deputation on the matter before the DSC May 25th.

By-Law 102 COA

In regards to By-Law # , I object to the proposed changes to the official By-Law procedures on the following grounds.

1. As a tax payer, long time resident, as many are, of Markham, our Constitutional Right to personally face, attend any legal matters within, not only our City, but our Country will be denied to individual Law Abiding Citizens of this community.
2. NOT ALL TAX PAYERS/RESIDENTS within Markham
  - A. Regularly receive the Local Newspapers, as the service OFTEN is Most Irregular
  - B. Read the Local Paper..... ??????... HOW do you intend to FORCE All Residents to Read, if possible and/or able, the Local Paper.
  - C. Do not have a full comprehension of the English Language (are of Urdu, Greek, Italian, Chinese (any Version), etc. language origin) and Are Tax Payers.
  - D. Who do have computers and may, or may not know their way about them, DO NOT Wish to have Their E-Mail Address made Public knowledge.
  - E. Who have computers are trusty of computer security be it their own systems OR that of the City of Markham
  - F. Have a Computer, NOR are Computer Literate
  - G. Are of an AGE with the ability to maneuver through the current City of Markham Website, which is Ever Changing.
  - H. Are of the ability to Write their objection, if any, due to physical issues. Hence, Opinions are best personally Deputized.
  - I. Computer Screens do NOT allow for accurate, clear visual of Any descriptive aides, such as plans, etc., as most often further moments of time are required to Inspect these aids. The time for this
  - J. Take REGULAR WALK ABOUTS encompassing their entire neighbourhood on a Daily/ Regular basis, within the 10 Day Prior Notice Period by Signage, to keep Up to Date on proposed Building/In-Fill Intentions by Developer/Owners.
  - K. Have the 'Flexibility' of TIME to sit through a computer session of 4-6 hours in front of a computer screen, with the ABOVE NOTED Issues in HOPES of visually and hearing correctly to understand, comprehend, with enough time the material presented by the developer/Owner. This gives, once again disregards the humane, legal rights of the constituent disallowing FULL DISCLOSURE of PROPOSAL AFFECT.
3. This PROPOSED By-Law is in FAVOUR of the 'Developer/Owner' of Primarily In-Fill Housing, as the Owness of AFFECTING THE NEIGHBOURHOOS' is extremely diminished by the Technological Restrictions IMPOSED upon the most probable questioning/objecting Overall Taxpaying, Direct Neighbourhood Public.
4. I can speak personally to ALL of these objections, as I can apply myself to each and every one of the above objections, as can MANY OTHER RESIDENTS in my area.
5. Our particular area is most grievously affected by ever constant and continued requests of OUT OF BY-LAW REQUIREMENT CHANGES to facilitate monster, cookie-cutter type homes in a WELL ESTABLISHED/HISTORICAL area with Mature Environment.
6. There is NO EMERGENCY in having to VARIANCE REQUESTS, as we DO HAVE accommodating BY-LAWS CURRENTLY In Place!!!!
7. IF this is a TEMPORARY MEASURE until the Emergency Status of ESSENTIAL GOVERNANCE is OVER, What is the TEMPORARY STATUS DATE ASSUMED? NOTE: The Numbers of COA, Predominately Variance Requests, due to the INABILITY OF OBJECTION DURING A PRESUMED LIMITED TIME has NO Number of Request Limitation, as it is Planning Dept/Dev. Serv. Dept. originated. This EASY ACCESS, due to the above limitations WILL SEE Excessive amounts of these requests during this period. The Other reason for this increase is and will be, the knowledge of the 'By-Laws Review Committee' work and intent.
8. COA VARAIANCEREQUESTS ARE NOT AN ESSENTIAL GOVERNANCE Issue, particularly as this Emergency Status is Time Limited. If it is considered so, on which grounds? Taxes are NOT being Correctly, NOR Timely levied on Many of the In-Fill

projects upon completion, thereby affecting the financial/responsible viability of the City of Markham and the responsible Tax Payer being Affected by these proposed Projects. The Tax Collection issue being resolved is Truly an Essential Responsible Governance.

Christiane Bergauer-Free