

**Appendix 'A' – Summary of Comments Received
(Proposed York Region 2051 Forecast)**

No.	Date	Individual/Organization	Comments	Staff Response
Written Submissions:				
1.	Apr 16/21	Malone Given Parsons on behalf of Kennedy Elgin Developments (11162 Kennedy Rd) and First Elgin Developments (4044 Elgin Mills Rd)	<p>Written submission and deputation received at Apr 19/21 DSC meeting on behalf of landowners regarding location of proposed additional employment lands [see Appendix 'B']</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • request lands (123 ha) north of Elgin Mills Rd between Warden Ave and Kennedy Rd be considered for community uses rather than employment uses • suggest lands east of Hwy 48 currently protected for future Pickering Airport be considered for employment uses (as PPS prohibits residential above 30 NEF) • TMP 2016 identifies Hwy 48 as Strategic Goods Movement Network for employment – shows Hwy 48 corridor but not Warden or Elgin Mills • Need to consider impact on Hamlet, and appropriateness of Elgin Mills as a safe truck route 	Comments addressed in Recommendations in staff report
2.	Apr 19/21 and May 10/21	Brutto Consulting on behalf of landowners on west side of Kennedy Rd (10936, 10992, 10994, 11022, 11248-11264, and 11288 Kennedy Rd)	<p>Deputation at Apr 19/21 DSC meeting and written submission to May 11/21 Special DSC meeting [see Appendix 'B']</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expressed concern with designating lands between Warden and Kennedy as employment as this will limit access to their client's property; and the location of the lands are not suitable for employment • client's lands (160 ac/65ha) include existing places of worship and cemeteries which are sensitive uses and more suited to form part of a residential community • employment uses within immediate proximity of Cashel and Almira communities will most impact the long-standing character of the areas 	Comments addressed in Recommendations in staff report

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will draw truck and significant passenger traffic that could cause a negative community impact; visual and noise impacts need to be more carefully considered as well • lands are well-removed from Hwy 404 Tier One Strategic Goods Movement Corridor • lands west of Kennedy contain environmentally sensitive features, making it very challenging to access the proposed employment areas on the west side of Kennedy • suggests there are many other areas in Markham that would be more viable for employment (e.g., east of Hwy 48) and that intensification of employment areas along Hwy 404 and Hwy 7 appear capable of achieving 2051 employment needs 	
3.	Apr 19/21	Unionville Ratepayers Association	<p>Written submission and deputation received at Apr 19/21 DSC meeting [see Appendix 'B']</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key issue is degree of intensification, and 100% of whitebelt lands being developed by 2051 • not advocating for 100% intensification, but feel that a Markham number above 60% should be readily achievable and should be tested • underlying issue is that Regional Council in 2019 directed staff to use the 50% Growth Plan intensification target minimum rather than 60% as recommended by Regional staff • suggest Region provides scenarios at 60% or 70%, i.e., scenarios that maintain some of Markham's whitebelt lands, have lower infrastructure costs, and have greater environmental benefits 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
4.	May 10/21	Weston Consulting on behalf of owners at 10701 Highway 48	<p>Written submission received at May 11/21 Special DSC meeting [see Appendix 'B']</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 ha/89 ac at southeast corner of Hwy 48 and Elgin Mills 	Acknowledged – lands are currently being proposed for inclusion in urban area as community area lands

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support the inclusion of the lands in the urban boundary and for community uses 	
Individuals (through email/meetings)				
1.	Apr 21/21	J Button (Almira resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about impact of urban development on the value of their property in the future 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
2.	May 23/21	L O'Donoghue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about the loss of agricultural land in Markham in consideration of food supply for next generations; do we want to rely on importing food 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
3.	May 27/21	B Royce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about the use of Markham's whitebelt lands to accommodate population growth; specific concerns noted were the impact on wildlife, vegetation and need to protect greenspaces for residents 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
4.	May 27/21	V Burke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about the proposal to urbanize all of Markham's remaining whitebelt lands to accommodate population growth suggested increasing the intensification target from 50% to avoid complete development of whitebelt lands comments also noted the need to protect wildlife and natural heritage corridors and concerns about the impacts of development on the climate crisis and increase in the urban heat island effect, and food security 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
5.	Jun 1/21	Yeesha (Almira resident; last name not provided)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about lands between Warden Avenue and Kennedy Road on 19th Avenue being proposed for future employment uses, and the impact on residents in Almira (i.e., residents being displaced, traffic from employment uses) petition submitted to Markham staff and ward councillor [see Appendix 'B'] 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report

6.	Jun 2/21	D Cubellis (on behalf of Almira resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern that current nature of Hamlet would be lost if there is development surrounding it; specific concerns with employment uses and traffic 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
7.	Jun 18/21	M Spinosa (on behalf of Almira property owner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expressed concern about lands in Almira being proposed for employment uses, and interest in maintaining a quieter residential environment 	Addressed in Recommendations in staff report
Meetings				
1.	May 6/21	Markham City Builder's Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> indicated that development industry was commenting through BILD directly with York Region the natural heritage 'take-outs' shown on Region's mapping need to be ground-truthed through development process the 70 residents +jobs/ha DGA minimum density is too high 	DGA minimum density target is addressed in staff report
2.	May 19/21	TRCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meeting discussion touched on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the extremely high quality of Rouge subwatersheds, and increasing quality of the subwatersheds moving eastward; impact of urbanization on the Little Rouge Corridor 	TRCA will comment directly to York Region through the MCR; subwatershed analysis needed prior to development approvals to understand impact
3.	May 21/21	City-wide Community Information Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seniors downsizing (moving out of detached ground-oriented housing) could also increase the supply of ground based units rather than urban expansion more transit investment and better transit service will be needed concern with losing all farmland in Markham; suggested modelling using only 50% of the whitebelt Region is using outdated population forecasts for growth centres intensification brings more noise residents were asked to accept more intensification during the last growth management exercise so that less urban 	Most comments addressed in Recommendations in the staff report

			<p>expansion would be needed, but now residents are being asked to both intensify and expand; why does Markham need to have so much growth; need a vision for the Yonge Corridor; need more parks and open space; questioned whether food security been taken into account in forecast; what is environmental impact of continued growth (e.g., additional garbage)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to consider climate crisis and achieving net zero; and that even though Markham is least expensive from infrastructure perspective, it also has the best agricultural lands; has food security and achieving net zero been taken into account in forecast; need to consult with agricultural community • consideration of impact of pandemic i.e., variations in work patterns (work from home) and future impact on land and built form needs 	
Development Services Committee				
1.	Apr 19/21	Development Services Committee Meeting	<p>Committee discussed the following relative to the staff report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • urban sprawl ramifications of York Region’s forecast that all of Markham’s whitebelt lands will be required to be developed by 2051 • need for a number of growth scenarios to be developed instead of making a decision on just one scenario • expectations for growth in Markham’s intensification areas (Markham Centre, Langstaff, and Yonge Street corridor) • the impact the extension of the Yonge subway will have on intensification, and implication if it doesn’t happen or if fewer than expected stations are built • the vision for the Major Mackenzie Drive BRT • the vision for the Buttonville area • the trend of developers increasingly submitting dense development proposals for lands in existing neighbourhoods and the impact on intensification 	<p>Most comments addressed by Markham and York Region staff at meeting; further addressed at May 11/21 Special Development Services meeting and in staff report</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Markham’s average growth rate over time • the impact of Markham achieving a higher intensification rate than the 52% proposed by York Region • the impact York Region’s proposed minimum intensification rate of 50% will have on urban sprawl if the majority of its whitebelt lands are developed by 2051; • the desire to retain some of Markham’s whitebelt lands and intensify other areas to reach York Region’s targeted growth for Markham (e.g., should explore implication of Markham having a 70% intensification rate) • the impact of intensification on downstream flooding in existing neighbourhoods • impact of the pandemic and carbon tax on growth forecasts • the lands north of Elgin Mills between Warden and Kennedy being designated as employment lands rather than for residential uses • impacts of certain regional infrastructure (e.g., Hwy 413) not getting approved on growth in the rest of the Region (e.g., will growth be redistributed) • what VIVA expansion is needed to make this work – how much money is needed for infrastructure in whitebelt vs intensification • what changes are needed in the transportation system to support full build out • can the forecasts be modified to keep up with changes in market demand, i.e., if preference for ground-related housing shifts to other forms 	
2.	May 11/21	Special Development Services Committee Meeting	<p>Committee discussed the following relative to the staff presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vaughan versus Markham’s employment forecasts • the accuracy of past employment and population forecasts for Markham, and Markham’s growth trends since the early 1980s 	Most comments addressed by Markham staff at meeting; further addressed in staff report

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the role resale housing plays in meeting demand for ground oriented housing in Markham • the development of all of the whitebelt lands by 2051 • the 52% intensification rate York Region is proposing for Markham • the implications of developing all of Markham’s whitebelt lands now or in the future; [i.e., no lands for future generations; • no need to include all of the whitebelt all at once; advocating 70% intensification • consider planning as if City is already out of whitebelt lands • opposition from residents to high density development proposals in their communities • managing growth in a way that is respectful to existing residents • consequence of not reaching the proposed growth targets (the province imposing Minister Zoning Orders, and developers appealing application to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal) • impact of MZOs on infrastructure needs • the environmental impact of developing new low-rise developments on whitebelt lands versus intensifying the existing urban area • the impact that increasing intensification in the urban boundary will have on need for development of Markham’s whitebelt lands • the importance of maintaining employment lands and continuing to attract new businesses to Markham; the importance of evaluating employment land conversion requests on their own merit; and a suggestion that there should have no net decrease in employment lands – any lands lost through conversion should be added elsewhere • how the use of office space may change after the COVID-19 pandemic 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the benefits of having employment lands close to the proposed Pickering Airport• the road network being planned for north Markham• future employment opportunities being planned for the Markham Gateway to the Rouge Urban National Park• the importance of phasing development of the whitebelt lands to manage the cost of growth through urban expansion• the importance of planning comprehensive rapid transit network improvements that support the growth forecast and new Transit Oriented Communities (e.g., additional stations on Stouffville GO line, Richmond Hill GO line, Yonge Subway extension beyond Hwy 7, 407 Transitway (Rail) with spurs into Pearson and Pickering Airports; Havelock Line from Peterborough to Union Station)• improvements to infrastructure, particularly transit infrastructure needed to keep pace with the amount of growth being forecast for Markham	
--	--	--	---	--