

Sylvia Gatti-Klein
April 14, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 32 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Sylvia Gatti-Klein

Ada and Vincent Corvese

April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 45 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Ada and Vincent Corvese

Anna and Nick R. Cino

April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

We have read the above noted report along with attachments and as long time home owners and significant tax payers, 14 years in one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, we are very opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by many community members and much wildlife.

PUTTING HI RISE TOWERS ON THIS LAND WOULD BE AN OUTRAGE !!!!

We also oppose to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

**HI RISE TOWERS WOULD CAUSE A FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE TO OUR
NEIGHBOURHOOD WHICH NO ONE WANTS, OR DESERVES.**

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

2.

We would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.

2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.

3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area. WHILE YOU ARE ARE AT IT , WHY NOT PUT ANOTHER CN TOWER ON THE HILL AS WELL.

4. Insufficient Public Notice. We only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Home owners and neighbours we interact with are rightly opposed to this development which would fundamentally alter our community by dramatically increasing the density, traffic congestion & pollution, with little regard for the zoning bylaws which have acted as a safeguard to date against rampant development. High rise condo towers on the banks of the

We request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Thank you for your consideration. We really need it.

Anna and Nick R. Cino

Barrie Aravandino

Today, 4:43 PM

Gold, Laura;

Clerks Public

Enterprise Vault

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.

We are strongly opposed to this development, and fully endorse the sentiments in the attached letter. We are long-time homeowners in Thornhill.

Barrie Aravandino

Judit Gaal.

Written Submission from David Mandelstam

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 35 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies’ Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.

2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

David Mandelstam

Dr Bernard Gryfe
April 14, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 32 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

- 2 -

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Jeff Budd
April 14, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have lived on Dale Park Court for about 25 years now, and love the neighbourhood, the privacy, though not so much the traffic, which is getting worse every year. I am sure others will elaborate on this topic.

What I am concerned with is the height of the buildings proposed for 7750 Bayview Avenue, the reduction of our privacy in our yards being peered at from on-high, and the stolen sunshine from our lives.

The planning act of Markham limits any other building from being within a 45-degree angular plane from a building's top. The current desires of 7750 Bayview Avenue Limited Partnership (Liberty Developments) of a 31-story building bordering the creek that would be shared with our backyards in Pomona Mills is much too tall. While the shadows at noon from these sky scrapers between spring and fall do not venture past this artificial 45-degree angular plane, that is not applicable to the shadow's effects in the morning and evening, nor in winter. Also note: the Shouldice property land the development is being built on is about 7 meters higher (an additional 2 stories equivalent) than the Pomona Mills housing, making the cast shadows even longer.

Fortunately, looking at the sun's elevation and its azimuth (where the sun is in the sky compared to a north-south line), with the sun rising at the southeast, the shadow from the north west building will hardly touch our neighbourhood; the shadows are generated in the morning to the north west. Unfortunately, this change of the sun's location on the horizon with the changing seasons means that in the summer, from first sunrise until approximately 10:00 AM, hundreds of residents of Pomona Mills will lose much of their morning sun. The shadow from the 31-story north-west skyscraper 20 minutes after sunrise will cross directly over Brooklet Court extending for 2.5 km to the south west (have all these residents been informed of this developer's plan? Those affected are at a greater distance than the current 200 meter notification regulations cover; they deserve to be notified). At 7:00AM, the shadow will be extending for about 0.5 km and will cover half the of the houses on Forest Park Court, and continue moving north covering houses on Henderson Avenue, and all the houses on Dale Park Court. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the shadows shorten, this tower will only

blanket half of the houses and yards on Del Glen Court by 9:00AM. The shadow leaves Pomona Mills and its homes almost four hours after sunrise.

The above describes is the coverage area for the north-west tower. As the morning progresses, the shorter 18-story west tower and 21-story south tower will also cloak some of Pomona Mills homes in gloom for a repeat of what went before, especially in the winter. All these towers are too tall. This loss of the best part of the day, a coffee in the early morning sun will be a thing of the past for us, for more money in a developers' pockets. Town council and the planning department does not have to give them this money at our expense.

It is astounding that Liberty Developments has the guts to put forth such a plan. I can only assume that the idea is that to get what they want, "let's start the negotiations at a vastly inflated position based on nothing that is any way reasonable and see where it goes from there". I and my neighbours are expecting that our elected government representatives and the Markham Development Services Committee who are in their offices to look after our interests do not entertain such a grotesque and appalling plan, and begin negotiating from an equally stupid starting point, perhaps three single-unit dwellings, each on a 2.5 acre lot. Now we are ready to meet half way.

As some may be in favour of increased density for environmental reasons, the same number of units and the same FST can be accommodated in our neighbourhood with one 8 to 10-story L-shaped building covering the land of, and between, the five current towers illustrated on the plan. The same number of residences can be created with little, and maybe no, increase in the FST ratio. Actually, 7750 Bayview can have a FST ratio of 5 by covering most of the land with one six-story building. That would be fine with me; it is not the ratio that is the problem, it is the height.

This solution is logical because:

- the heights are within reason for the existing neighbourhood and land uses
- the FST ratio is what Liberty Developments is asking for, even though double the planning act FST.
- the same increase in density, if that is what is desired, is obtained though it likely exceeds the capacity of the neighbourhood to absorb these new residents in a number of areas
- there will be less external wall (mostly of very poorly insulating glass) in the building, therefore the buildings will be more energy efficient.

The only downside to this re-design of the plan is the units will not sell for as much money, money, money; what this entire proposed project plan is all about for Liberty Developments, not the creation of a livable neighbourhood.

As long time residents in this area, we are extremely disappointed to see such an application that blatantly ignores city plans and has no consideration to the current neighbourhoods or the residents' enjoyment of their homes. We expect to see a reasonable re-design that meets the current plan and respects neighbourhoods and residents' rights. This development will have significant impacts on traffic, sunlight, and neighbourhoods, and cannot be allowed to move forward in its current form.

Sincerely,
Jeff Budd

Ron and Lilian Pellegrini

April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 42 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Ron and Lilian Pellegrini

From: Jeff Peng

Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 3:01 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Councillor, Keith Irish - Markham <KIrish@markham.ca>

Subject: DSC Meeting - April 19, 2021 - Item 9.4 PRELIMINARY REPORT APPLICATIONS BY 7750 BAYVIEW AVENUE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (LIBERTY DEVELOPMENTS) FOR OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO PERMIT FIVE (5) HIGH RISE APARTMENT TOWERS AT 7750 BAYVIEW

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.

Dear sirs,

I have read the submission of April 14, 2021 from my neighbor, Syliva Gatti-Klein (copy attached) and **I fully endorse with her comprehensive submission.**

I also oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as 'Mixed Use High Rise' and the designated 'Greenway' boundaries being revised.

I also oppose the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which increase the current maximum building height of 10 stories.

I really hope that the Markham Development Service Committee and Council have the fortitude to stand their ground and not be pushed around by a developer who is clearly out of line.

Anbing Peng

Written Submission from Paul Vaughan (9.4 - 7750 Bayview Avenue Liberty Developments)

I sent an email on March 22, 2021 objecting to what I consider to be an outlandish property development proposal by Liberty Development. The proposed high rises in no way fit with the general community and would cause other issues such as traffic.

I have read the submission of April 14, 2021 from my neighbour, Syliva Gatti-Klein. (copy attached) **I am in complete agreement with her comprehensive submission.**

I also oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as ' Mixed Use High Rise' and the designated 'Greenway' boundaries being revised.

I also oppose the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which increase the current maximum building height of 10 stories.

I have had discussions with many of my neighbours since first learning about this proposal. The reaction has been one of disbelief that such a proposal for highrises in the neighbourhood would even be made let alone considered by the City of Markham. Our able Councillor for Ward 1, Keith Irish, set me straight by stating that the City must consider proposals no matter how outlandish.

I really hope that the Markham Development Service Committee and Council have the fortitude to stand their ground and not be pushed around by a developer who is clearly out of line.

Paul **Vaughn** Hibbits
Thornhill, ON., L3T 2A2

Bob Sudeyko
April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for
Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice
Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 32 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

- 2 -

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies’ Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.

2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.

3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.

4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Bob Sudeyko

Markham Development Service Committee,

I am writing this letter to object to the property development proposal at 7750 Bayview avenue submitted by Liberty Development.

As an owner of a house adjacent to the western boundary of the development site, I strongly oppose any Amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the town of Markham official plan (revised 187) and the Thornhill secondary plan, which would result in the subject lands being re-designed as "Mixed Use High Rise" and the designated "Greenway" boundaries being revised.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62, which would increase the current maximum building height of (10) stories.

Considering the increased traffic congestion on John st in recent years, adding high-rise buildings will only worsen the situation. Also, having high-rise buildings is strongly against the heritage look and feel of John street and the surrounding area.

Liberty development's very low quality of work was revealed to everyone by the World on Yonge project. Residents of that project are still having many problems with their units.

I am also concerned regarding the communication of this project with the community. I learned about this proposal from one of the neighbours, and it was not easy to find information online.

We love our community. We are asking Development Service Committee and all other Committees to take these objections seriously and prevent an infamous developer from changing the face of our neighbourhood forever.

Best Regards,
Arash Tajalli-Yazdi Thornhill L3T 2A2

--

Arash Tajalli-Yazdi
CEO and Co-Founder at Mealsy.ca

Pho Lai and Silvia Ip
Thornhill, ON L3T
2A3

April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of many years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Pho Lai and Silvia Ip

Pho Lai and Silvia Ip
Thornhill, ON L3T
2A3
April 15, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have lived on Dale Park Court for about 25 years now, and love the neighbourhood, the privacy, though not so much the traffic, which is getting worse every year. I am sure others will elaborate on this topic.

What I am concerned with is the height of the buildings proposed for 7750 Bayview Avenue, the reduction of our privacy in our yards being peered at from on-high, and the stolen sunshine from our lives.

The planning act of Markham limits any other building from being within a 45-degree angular plane from a building's top. The current desires of 7750 Bayview Avenue Limited Partnership (Liberty Developments) of a 31-story building bordering the creek that would be shared with our backyards in Pomona Mills is much too tall. While the shadows at noon from these sky scrapers between spring and fall do not venture past this artificial 45-degree angular plane, that is not applicable to the shadow's effects in the morning and evening, nor in winter. Also note: the Shouldice property land the development is being built on is about 7 meters higher (an additional 2 stories equivalent) than the Pomona Mills housing, making the cast shadows even longer.

Fortunately, looking at the sun's elevation and its azimuth (where the sun is in the sky compared to a north-south line), with the sun rising at the southeast, the shadow from the north west building will hardly touch our neighbourhood; the shadows are generated in the morning to the north west. Unfortunately, this change of the sun's location on the horizon with the changing seasons means that in the summer, from first sunrise until approximately 10:00 AM, hundreds of residents of Pomona Mills will lose much of their morning sun. The shadow from the 31-story north-west skyscraper 20 minutes after sunrise will cross directly over Brooklet Court extending for 2.5 km to the south west (have all these residents been informed of this developer's plan? Those affected are at a greater distance than the current 200 meter notification regulations cover; they deserve to be notified). At 7:00AM, the shadow will be extending for about 0.5 km and will cover half the of the houses on Forest Park Court, and continue moving north covering houses on Henderson Avenue, and all the houses on Dale Park Court. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the shadows shorten, this tower will only

blanket half of the houses and yards on Del Glen Court by 9:00AM. The shadow leaves Pomona Mills and its homes almost four hours after sunrise.

The above describes is the coverage area for the north-west tower. As the morning progresses, the shorter 18-story west tower and 21-story south tower will also cloak some of Pomona Mills homes in gloom for a repeat of what went before, especially in the winter. All these towers are too tall. This loss of the best part of the day, a coffee in the early morning sun will be a thing of the past for us, for more money in a developers' pockets. Town council and the planning department does not have to give them this money at our expense.

It is astounding that Liberty Developments has the guts to put forth such a plan. I can only assume that the idea is that to get what they want, "let's start the negotiations at a vastly inflated position based on nothing that is any way reasonable and see where it goes from there". I and my neighbours are expecting that our elected government representatives and the Markham Development Services Committee who are in their offices to look after our interests do not entertain such a grotesque and appalling plan, and begin negotiating from an equally stupid starting point, perhaps three single-unit dwellings, each on a 2.5 acre lot. Now we are ready to meet half way.

As some may be in favour of increased density for environmental reasons, the same number of units and the same FST can be accommodated in our neighbourhood with one 8 to 10-story L-shaped building covering the land of, and between, the five current towers illustrated on the plan. The same number of residences can be created with little, and maybe no, increase in the FST ratio. Actually, 7750 Bayview can have a FST ratio of 5 by covering most of the land with one six-story building. That would be fine with me; it is not the ratio that is the problem, it is the height.

This solution is logical because:

- the heights are within reason for the existing neighbourhood and land uses
- the FST ratio is what Liberty Developments is asking for, even though double the planning act FST.
- the same increase in density, if that is what is desired, is obtained though it likely exceeds the capacity of the neighbourhood to absorb these new residents in a number of areas
- there will be less external wall (mostly of very poorly insulating glass) in the building, therefore the buildings will be more energy efficient.

The only downside to this re-design of the plan is the units will not sell for as much money, money, money; what this entire proposed project plan is all about for Liberty Developments, not the creation of a livable neighbourhood.

As long time residents in this area, we are extremely disappointed to see such an application that blatantly ignores city plans and has no consideration to the current neighbourhoods or the residents' enjoyment of their homes. We expect to see a reasonable re-design that meets the current plan and respects neighbourhoods and residents' rights. This development will have significant impacts on traffic, sunlight, and neighbourhoods, and cannot be allowed to move forward in its current form.

Sincerely,
Pho Lai and Silvia Ip

To: Markham Development Service Committee

Hi,

My name is Jesse Li. Our family have lived on Henderson Ave for about 10 years now. We love the neighbourhood. I am writing to raise the concern and object the development of the Plan 20 126269. Please see the attached letter.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Regards

Jesse and Tak

Tak Yeung
Jesse Li
Thornhill, ON L3T 2M2

April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of many years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Tak Yeung
Jesse Li

David Levitt

Markham, ON L3T 2M7

April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have lived on Forest Park Crescent for 8 years and love the neighbourhood, the privacy, though not so much the traffic, which is getting worse every year.

What I am concerned with is the height of the buildings proposed for 7750 Bayview Avenue, the reduction of our privacy in our yards being peered at from on-high, and the stolen sunshine from our lives.

The planning act of Markham limits any other building from being within a 45-degree angular plane from a building's top. The current desires of 7750 Bayview Avenue Limited Partnership (Liberty Developments) of a 31-story building bordering the creek that would be shared with our backyards in Pomona Mills is much too tall. While the shadows at noon from these sky scrapers between spring and fall do not venture past this artificial 45-degree angular plane, that is not applicable to the shadow's effects in the morning and evening, nor in winter. Also note: the Shouldice property land the development is being built on is about 7 meters higher (an additional 2 stories equivalent) than the Pomona Mills housing, making the cast shadows even longer.

Fortunately, looking at the sun's elevation and its azimuth (where the sun is in the sky compared to a north-south line), with the sun rising at the southeast, the shadow from the north west building will hardly touch our neighbourhood; the shadows are generated in the morning to the north west. Unfortunately, this change of the sun's location on the horizon with the changing seasons means that in the summer, from first sunrise until approximately 10:00 AM, hundreds of residents of Pomona Mills will

lose much of their morning sun. The shadow from the 31-story north-west skyscraper 20 minutes after sunrise will cross directly over Brooklet Court extending for 2.5 km to the south west (have all these residents been informed of this developer's plan? Those affected are at a greater distance than the current 200 meter notification regulations cover; they deserve to be notified). At 7:00AM, the shadow will be extending for about 0.5 km and will cover half the of the houses on Forest Park Court, and continue moving north covering houses on Henderson Avenue, and all the houses on Dale Park Court. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the shadows shorten, this tower will only blanket half of the houses and yards on Del Glen Court by 9:00AM. The shadow leaves Pomona Mills and its homes almost four hours after sunrise.

The above describes is the coverage area for the north-west tower. As the morning progresses, the shorter 18-story west tower and 21-story south tower will also cloak some of Pomona Mills homes in gloom for a repeat of what went before, especially in the winter. All these towers are too tall.

As long time residents in this area, we are extremely disappointed to see such an application that blatantly ignores city plans and has no consideration to the current neighbourhoods or the residents' enjoyment of their homes. We expect to see a reasonable re-design that meets the current plan and respects neighbourhoods and residents' rights. This development will have significant impacts on traffic, sunlight, and neighbourhoods, and cannot be allowed to move forward in its current form.

Thanks so much,

Sincerely,

David Levitt

David Levitt

Markham, ON L3T 2M7

April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan

and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have lived on Forest Park Crescent for 8 years and love the neighbourhood, the privacy, though not so much the traffic, which is getting worse every year.

What I am concerned with is the height of the buildings proposed for 7750 Bayview Avenue, the reduction of our privacy in our yards being peered at from on-high, and the stolen sunshine from our lives.

The planning act of Markham limits any other building from being within a 45-degree angular plane from a building's top. The current desires of 7750 Bayview Avenue Limited Partnership (Liberty Developments) of a 31-story building bordering the creek that would be shared with our backyards in Pomona Mills is much too tall. While the shadows at noon from these sky scrapers between spring and fall do not venture past this artificial 45-degree angular plane, that is not applicable to the shadow's effects in the morning and evening, nor in winter. Also note: the Shouldice property land the development is being built on is about 7 meters higher (an additional 2 stories equivalent) than the Pomona Mills housing, making the cast shadows even longer.

Fortunately, looking at the sun's elevation and its azimuth (where the sun is in the sky compared to a north-south line), with the sun rising at the southeast, the shadow from the north west building will hardly touch our neighbourhood; the shadows are generated in the morning to the north west. Unfortunately, this change of the sun's location on the horizon with the changing seasons means that in the summer, from first sunrise until approximately 10:00 AM, hundreds of residents of Pomona Mills will

lose much of their morning sun. The shadow from the 31-story north-west skyscraper 20 minutes after sunrise will cross directly over Brooklet Court extending for 2.5 km to the south west (have all these residents been informed of this developer's plan? Those affected are at a greater distance than the current 200 meter notification regulations cover; they deserve to be notified). At 7:00AM, the shadow will be extending for about 0.5 km and will cover half the of the houses on Forest Park Court, and continue moving north covering houses on Henderson Avenue, and all the houses on Dale Park Court. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the shadows shorten, this tower will only blanket half of the houses and yards on Del Glen Court by 9:00AM. The shadow leaves Pomona Mills and its homes almost four hours after sunrise.

The above describes is the coverage area for the north-west tower. As the morning progresses, the shorter 18-story west tower and 21-story south tower will also cloak some of Pomona Mills homes in gloom for a repeat of what went before, especially in the winter. All these towers are too tall.

As long time residents in this area, we are extremely disappointed to see such an application that blatantly ignores city plans and has no consideration to the current neighbourhoods or the residents' enjoyment of their homes. We expect to see a reasonable re-design that meets the current plan and respects neighbourhoods and residents' rights. This development will have significant impacts on traffic, sunlight, and neighbourhoods, and cannot be allowed to move forward in its current form.

Thanks so much,

Sincerely,

David Levitt

April 14, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of over 32 years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as "Mixed Use Mid Rise" and "Greenway", permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as "Mixed Use High Rise" and the designated "Greenway" boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as "Urban Residential" and "High Density II Housing" plus "Hazard Land and Buffer Area", relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, "Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway)." This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural

features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

- 2 -

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.

2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.

3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.

4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Eva Walker
Thornhill

To: Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold

re: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan and Zoning
By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

We are sending this email as homeowners of 2 Brooklet Crt. (21 years) in order to add our voices to those of our neighbors and other concerned citizens of Markham in strong objection to the re-designation of the subject lands and boundaries and to the amendment of the zoning by-laws 2237, 209-94, and 2006-62 which increase building height beyond the current maximum.

We have read the attached letters of our neighbors Sylvia Gatti-Klein and Jeff Budd and agree with the content of these submissions.

Thank you for your consideration of our community

Sincerely,

Rick and Kelly Russo

Markham ON, L3T 2M9

Xiayi Guo
Thornhill, ON L3T 2M8
April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a long time home owner and significant tax payer of many years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as “Mixed Use Mid Rise” and “Greenway”, permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) storeys and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as “Mixed Use High Rise” and the designated “Greenway” boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as “Urban Residential” and “High Density II Housing” plus “Hazard Land and Buffer Area”, relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) storeys.

As noted in the report, “Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway).” This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.
2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.
3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.
4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every home owner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Xiayi Guo

Xiayi Guo
Thornhill, ON L3T 2M8

April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan
and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)
Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have lived on Forest Park Crescent for about 5 years now, and love the neighbourhood, the privacy, though not so much the traffic, which is getting worse every year. I am sure others will elaborate on this topic.

What I am concerned with is the height of the buildings proposed for 7750 Bayview Avenue, the reduction of our privacy in our yards being peered at from on-high, and the stolen sunshine from our lives.

The planning act of Markham limits any other building from being within a 45-degree angular plane from a building's top. The current desires of 7750 Bayview Avenue Limited Partnership (Liberty Developments) of a 31-story building bordering the creek that would be shared with our backyards in Pomona Mills is much too tall. While the shadows at noon from these sky scrapers between spring and fall do not venture past this artificial 45-degree angular plane, that is not applicable to the shadow's effects in the morning and evening, nor in winter. Also note: the Shouldice property land the development is being built on is about 7 meters higher (an additional 2 stories equivalent) than the Pomona Mills housing, making the cast shadows even longer.

Fortunately, looking at the sun's elevation and its azimuth (where the sun is in the sky compared to a north-south line), with the sun rising at the southeast, the shadow from the north west building will hardly touch our neighbourhood; the shadows are generated in the morning to the north west. Unfortunately, this change of the sun's location on the horizon with the changing seasons means that in the summer, from first sunrise until approximately 10:00 AM, hundreds of residents of Pomona Mills will lose much of their morning sun. The shadow from the 31-story north-west skyscraper 20 minutes after sunrise will cross directly over Brooklet Court extending for 2.5 km to the south west (have all these residents been informed of this developer's plan? Those affected are at a greater distance than the current 200 meter notification regulations cover; they deserve to be notified). At 7:00AM, the shadow will be extending for about 0.5 km and will cover half the of the houses on Forest Park Court, and continue moving north covering houses on Henderson Avenue, and all the houses on Dale Park Court. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the shadows shorten, this tower will only

blanket half of the houses and yards on Del Glen Court by 9:00AM. The shadow leaves Pomona Mills and its homes almost four hours after sunrise.

The above describes is the coverage area for the north-west tower. As the morning progresses, the shorter 18-story west tower and 21-story south tower will also cloak some of Pomona Mills homes in gloom for a repeat of what went before, especially in the winter. All these towers are too tall. This loss of the best part of the day, a coffee in the early morning sun will be a thing of the past for us, for more money in a developers' pockets. Town council and the planning department does not have to give them this money at our expense.

It is astounding that Liberty Developments has the guts to put forth such a plan. I can only assume that the idea is that to get what they want, "let's start the negotiations at a vastly inflated position based on nothing that is any way reasonable and see where it goes from there". I and my neighbours are expecting that our elected government representatives and the Markham Development Services Committee who are in their offices to look after our interests do not entertain such a grotesque and appalling plan, and begin negotiating from an equally stupid starting point, perhaps three single-unit dwellings, each on a 2.5 acre lot. Now we are ready to meet half way.

As some may be in favour of increased density for environmental reasons, the same number of units and the same FST can be accommodated in our neighbourhood with one 8 to 10-story L-shaped building covering the land of, and between, the five current towers illustrated on the plan. The same number of residences can be created with little, and maybe no, increase in the FST ratio. Actually, 7750 Bayview can have a FST ratio of 5 by covering most of the land with one six-story building. That would be fine with me; it is not the ratio that is the problem, it is the height.

This solution is logical because:

- the heights are within reason for the existing neighbourhood and land uses
- the FST ratio is what Liberty Developments is asking for, even though double the planning act FST.
- the same increase in density, if that is what is desired, is obtained though it likely exceeds the capacity of the neighbourhood to absorb these new residents in a number of areas
- there will be less external wall (mostly of very poorly insulating glass) in the building, therefore the buildings will be more energy efficient.

The only downside to this re-design of the plan is the units will not sell for as much money, money, money; what this entire proposed project plan is all about for Liberty Developments, not the creation of a livable neighbourhood.

As long time residents in this area, we are extremely disappointed to see such an application that blatantly ignores city plans and has no consideration to the current neighbourhoods or the residents' enjoyment of their homes. We expect to see a reasonable re-design that meets the current plan and respects neighbourhoods and residents' rights. This development will have significant impacts on traffic, sunlight, and neighbourhoods, and cannot be allowed to move forward in its current form.

Sincerely,
Xiayi Guo

Deena Levitt
Thornhill, ON L3T 2M7

April 16, 2021

Markham Development Service Committee

c/o Laura Gold, lgold@markham.ca and clerkspublic@markham.ca

Subject: PLAN 20 126269 (Ward 1), Preliminary Report, Application for Official Plan

and Zoning By-law Amendments for 7750 Bayview Ave. (Shouldice Hospital)

Meeting Date: April 19, 2021

I have read the above noted report along with attachments and as a home owner and significant tax payer of many years of one of the houses adjacent to the western boundary of subject property, I am very much opposed to any further amendments to the Zoning By-laws as requested by Liberty Developments.

The report states that the Markham Official Plan 2014 designates the subject property as "Mixed Use Mid Rise" and "Greenway" permitting a maximum building height of eight (8) stories and maximum overall site density of up to 2.0 FSI.

I oppose amendments to the Markham Official Plan 2014, the Town of Markham Official Plan (Revised 1987) and the Thornhill Secondary Plan, which would result in the subject lands being re-designated as "Mixed Use High Rise" and the designated "Greenway" boundaries being revised. The subject property would also be re-designated as "Urban Residential" and "High Density II Housing" plus "Hazard Land and Buffer Area", relaxing the current prohibition of further development of the natural surrounding land, thereby disturbing the natural state of the property used by much wildlife and many community members.

I am also opposed to the Zoning By-law Amendments to By-laws 2237, 209-94 and 2006-62 which would increase the current maximum building height of ten (10) stories.

As noted in the report, "Regional staff have commented that the heights and densities of the current proposal are more appropriate where supported by higher order transit (ie. such as a subway)." This is all the more relevant given that the proposed plans do not include sufficient parking spaces for both residents and visitors. (ie. 20 % less than what the Zoning By-laws require)

I would also suggest that the Heritage Planning staff expand the Heritage Impact Assessment to broaden its comprehensive overview of the historical and architectural features of the surrounding historical lands, encompassing the nearby historic Village of Thornhill and

Heintzman House. Strict development restrictions have been placed on the surrounding low rise residential housing in and around the Village along John St. and this high rise high density

development would not be at all compatible with the homogeneous housing community at large in this area of Thornhill.

Further objections relate to the following considerations:

1. Sewer drainage problems. We all remember the severe flooding of the Pomona Valley and all the resulting damage to many of the area homes as a result of inadequate sewer drainage in the area. Although the sewer pipes were partially renewed, there has been increased need due to the new condominium complex behind the railway tracks at Bayview since that infamous storm, the current development of the Tridel buildings off the Ladies' Golf Course and the future development of another large complex on Bayview Ave and John St. immediately across from the Shouldice Hospital. These aforementioned developments have and will add to the already strained drainage system, prior to the addition of this proposed development of 2,012 units.

2. Traffic congestion and safety on John Street and the intersection of John St. and Bayview Ave. During recent years traffic congestion has increased significantly on John St., particularly during rush hours, resulting in long travel time required to travel less than one kilometer. Through traffic does not easily yield to local traffic exiting the Pomona Valley at Henderson Ave., resulting in more accidents and near accidents.

3. This proposed development, situated on a hill and undoubtedly visible from kilometers away, would tremendously interfere with the visual symmetry of the entire area.

4. Insufficient Public Notice. I only very recently learned of this proposed development from a neighbour by word of mouth. Discussions with other neighbours revealed that none of them were aware of this project and therefore did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Every homeowner in the area that I have spoken with is opposed to this development.

I request that the Development Service Committee and all other Committees take these objections of long time home owners and tax payers into consideration and not amend the By-laws in question.

Sincerely,

Deena Levitt