

From: Lav Shelat

Sent: January 23, 2022 12:17 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: Notice - Special Development Services Committee, January 24, 2022 - 4.1 CITY COMMENTS ON PROVINCIAL BRIDGE STATION TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITY PROPOSAL (WARD 1)

Hello,

Please have this presented at the DSC Meeting on Jan 24.

Thank you

Mr. Mayor and Council Members,

To the best of my knowledge/understanding, in relation to the Yonge North Subway Extension, the agenda of this DSC meeting on Jan 24, seems to be not considering that The Markham Council has already passed the motion to have the YNSE aligned to Yonge. We, in the Royal Orchard Community (RO), urge DSC to make the said motion as part of the agenda because that is the starting point of our objections to YNSE. I am afraid by not taking that fact in to account/on record, in itself is fraught with being perceived that the City Council is no longer objecting to the routing of tunnels under the homes/properties of Royal Orchard residents, and they are now concerned only with the Transit Oriented Community issue.

You start your meeting with the Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. We believe that you represent us, our hopes, our fears, our well being and that at every occasion when there is a discussion/representation/meeting (including DSC meetings) in relation to YNSE, we expect you to shine the light on our plight. After all, the same instincts that led to atrocities against Indigenous peoples in taking away their land are now being inflicted on the residents of RO Community.

We are the common folks (pensioners, old, children, disabled, women, diverse would people) who have been civil in all our protests/requests, and we expect our representatives to honor your commitment to us. We ask that you summon up the moral strength and call out the complete unreasonableness of option 3 (cleverly re-named as green route or adjusted route). Their use of force through unjust implementation of laws that seem to have been passed during the pandemic, their use of jargon/terminology to mislead, their single-minded pursuit to view the project only from the perspective of so-called future development to the benefit of some, are once again evidenced in the disingenuous promotion of their Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community Proposal.

Metrolinx representatives have repeatedly admitted that their Option 3 is founded on the location of the Bridge Station. With that as a constraint given to a public body that is viewing the project primarily from engineering perspective, obviously they are giving least financial cost-solution without giving primacy to the ruinous consequences on living human beings. That is where we expect the City Council to continually hold the torch on every occasion (meetings, presentations, discussions etc.) and not allow yourselves to be oriented only in the directions they want you to.

Environment

A number of species at risk have been identified as endangered in the area proposed by YNSE. During the Pandemic (with limited human intervention), we have witnessed the revival of nature in our creek/ravine. We are sighting a variety of birds/animals that cohabit with us. This is not the natural feature along Yonge which is already commercialized, and more multi-storied buildings are coming up. This in and of itself should be sufficient to stir up the conscience and moral strength to keep the subway aligned to Yonge. In a nation that has a proud distinction of caring for nature, Cities/Authorities are further blessed with a burden to honor our tradition lest we end up repeating dark chapters (e.g., treatment of indigenous peoples, commercial seal hunt, expulsion of Japanese Canadians, Lake Pollution) of our history.

- A. Would the DSC/City/Regional Council ask Metrolinx to provide all the information, not only the final report, on environment study? For example, the initial draft report, their discussions and notes from the discussions with the Environment Ministry/other authorities? Is the Report getting weaponized to back up an already predetermined decision? Are the proponents of Option 3 objectively and transparently looking at all the issues, including impact on human beings?
- B. When the authorities are pushing for a large-scale development in the Langstaff area, should the decision makers/enablers double-down on a strategy to protect the RO Community as a green space to offer a counterbalance?
- C. Isn't taking care of our environment also an issue of justice? Or should we allow the supremacy of the wealthy over our environment?

Misleading

In the past, on several occasions, RO community residents have pointed out the inconsistencies, vague and deceptive tactics used by Metrolinx in their single-minded pursuit of Option 3 (cleverly now being positioned as an adjusted route or green route). Here is another example. I and some other residents of Kirk Drive received a personalized letter on December 8 that says "Our early assessment is that a tunnel would travel directly under your home. The subway tunnels will be deep underground, ranging anywhere between 21 meters to 50 meters below the surface in Royal Orchard Community." In what

seems to be an attempt to mislead/deceive us, on January 5 at the “Virtual Open House meeting”, Steve Collins from Metrolinx quickly glossed over the issue of depth of the tunnel with respect to the Kirk Drive and said “...the tunnel will be a minimum of 21 meters deep below the Community with an average increase of 10 meters... increasing the depth is important from the ***perception of effects***...for fuller understanding the tunnels below the houses in the vicinity of Kirk Drive and Thorny Brae Drive **REMAIN APPROXIMATELY AT THE SAME DEPTH AS PREVIOUS ROUTE.** The reason being we are constrained by the Bridge Station...”

A) The letter of December 8 tells us that the depth of the tunnel is between 21 and 50 meters from our houses on Kirk Drive while Steve Collins says, “remaining same as the previous route”. What is the truth? This blatantly misleading information from a public body is extremely alarming and you as our council/councilor are requested to bring this up at a public platform/media to highlight the callous attitude we are faced with.

B) Many residents on Kirk Drive have CN Rail behind their backyards. The compounding effect of CN Trains and 17/18 hours of subway trains is not even studied, mentioned, or recognized in their presentations/discussions. Why are we being segregated as a “marginal” group when we are the most impacted by Option 3 (double whammy)? Shouldn't you, the City/Regional Council espouse our cause in particular since we are the most disadvantaged?

C) Metrolinx's continuing to use the terms at the Jan 5 meeting, like “perception of effects”, “imperceptible effect on the community”, “minimum noise and vibration” is yet another tactic by Metrolinx to mislead and gloss over the facts/truth. Clearly the truth is getting blurred with such jargon-engineering-speak.

D) Metrolinx's use of “average depth” is yet another play of words in ill-informing the community

E) It is their single-minded pursuit to deliver the Bridge Station, which favors a future development/certain developer, which is a major constraint, as Steve himself admits (please watch the recorded meeting of Jan 5). As an engineering firm, if they are given a constraint, i.e., Bridge Station above ground at a specific location, then obviously they will design their solutions around that constraint. And now that The DSC has on its agenda the “Transit Oriented Community” issue/proposal, we once again request you to forcefully and publicly broadcast that the City is against the Bridge station as planned.

You are our only hope. We know that the representatives of other Cities (e.g., Richmond Hill) would be guided by their short term socio-political and economic advantages when they get to see how our City has responded to Option 3 and TOC. You have a great opportunity to demonstrate that you support building the extension but not under the homes/properties of living residents. We are simple folks – pensioners, aging, community-

oriented. In this entire episode of tunnels under our homes, we are being held hostage to a decision that adversely impacts us.

Before you start your discussions, please take a minute to put your hand on your heart and ask yourself the following questions:

1. Would you like to have a transit under your home?
2. Would you be willing to give an unconditional, legally valid guarantee in writing to the residents of RO Community that none will be impacted by the noise, vibrations, damages, adverse effects on mental health due to their option 3?
3. By going along with their Option 3, if you cannot give me the same quality of life that I enjoy today, how can you allow someone to assume the right to take away something that I already have?
4. How can you justify a benefit to the potential future population in Langstaff area when the Option 3 is ruinous to a living community under your charge?
5. How can you, individually and collectively, get them back to the drawing board on other alternatives that do not impact living residents in communities under your charge?

If you would not buy a home as your primary residence that has a transit tunnel under it, how can you enable your constituent that you represent to suffer such a fate?

Thank you for your time and please ensure through the DSC meeting you do not enable option 3 that goes under our homes and properties.

Respect

Lav

--

Lav Shelat