

Special Development Services Committee Minutes

Meeting Number 2
January 24, 2022, 9:30 AM - 1:00 PM
Live streamed

Roll Call	Mayor Frank Scarpitti Deputy Mayor Don Hamilton Regional Councillor Jack Heath Regional Councillor Joe Li Regional Councillor Jim Jones Councillor Keith Irish Councillor Alan Ho	Councillor Reid McAlpine Councillor Karen Rea Councillor Andrew Keyes Councillor Amanda Collucci Councillor Khalid Usman Councillor Isa Lee
Staff	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer Arvin Prasad, Commissioner, Development Services Morgan Jones, Commissioner, Community Services Claudia Storto, City Solicitor and Director of Human Resources Adam Grant, Fire Chief Frank Clarizio, Director, Engineering & Urban Design Biju Karumanchery, Director, Planning & Urban Design Bryan Frois, Manager of Executive Operations & Strategic Initiatives Francesco Santaguida, Assistant City Solicitor Ronji Borooh, City Architect Loy Cheah, Senior Manager, Transportation Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage	Darryl Lyons, Manager, Policy Stephen Lue, Manager, Central District Amanda Crompton, Planner II Marty Rokos, Senior Planner Laura Gold, Council/Committee Coordinator Clement Messere, Acting Manager, Development - West Peter Wokral, Senior Planner Lawrence Yip, Senior Planner, Urban Design Samson Wat, Senior Project Engineer Nhat-Anh Nguyen, Senior Manager, Development & Environmental Alice Lam, Director of Operations

Alternate formats for this document are available upon request

1. CALL TO ORDER

In consideration of the ongoing public health orders, this meeting was conducted electronically to maintain physical distancing of participants. With the passage of the *COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act, 2020* (Bill 197), municipal Council Members are now permitted to meet remotely and count towards quorum.

The Special Development Services Committee convened at 9:35 AM with Regional Councillor Jim Jones in the Chair.

Committee recessed from 12:50 to 1:00 PM.

INDIGENOUS LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We begin today by acknowledging the traditional territories of Indigenous peoples and their commitment to stewardship of the land. We acknowledge the communities in circle. The North, West, South and Eastern directions, and Haudenosaunee, Huron-Wendat, Anishnabeg, Seneca, Chippewa, and the current treaty holders Mississaugas of the Credit peoples. We share the responsibility with the caretakers of this land to ensure the dish is never empty and to restore relationships that are based on peace, friendship, and trust. We are committed to reconciliation, partnership and enhanced understanding.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Moved by Councillor Keith Irish

Seconded by Councillor Isa Lee

That the written submission from Luv Shelat regarding the City Comments on Provincial Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community Proposal (Ward 1) (10.0, 13.3), be received.

Carried

4. REPORTS

4.1 CITY COMMENTS ON PROVINCIAL BRIDGE STATION TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITY PROPOSAL (WARD 1) (10.0, 13.3)

Arvin Prasad, Commissioner of Development Services, introduced the item, advising that the density proposed in the Province's Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community (TOC) Proposal exceeds what was envisioned in the

Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan, which prioritizes creating a complete community where residents want to live, work, and play. Mr. Prasad advised that the Province is seeking zoning certainty for the TOC proposal by March 1, 2022, and that staff anticipate the use of a Minister's Zoning Order.

Darryl Lyons provided a presentation titled "City Comments on Provincial Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community Proposal".

Graham Churchill provided a deputation on the City Comments on the Provincial Bridge Station TOC Proposal. Mr. Churchill advised that the density being proposed in the Bridge Station TOC Proposal would make it one of the densest communities in the world when combined with the High Tech TOC Proposal. Mr. Churchill outlined that the combined High Tech and Bridge Station TOCs density is 200,000 people per square kilometre, which exceeds the densest city in Hong Kong, Manhattan and St. James Town in Toronto. Mr. Churchill suggested that great rivers, parks, and trails make great cities, noting that there is an opportunity to incorporate a great natural system feature that connects to the Toronto Ravine System, and/or that runs between to Yonge Street and Bayview Avenue in the Bridge Station TOC. Mr. Churchill questioned how the 407 Transitway fits into the plan for the Bridge Station TOC.

Committee discussed the following relative to the staff report on the Provincial Bridge Station TOC Proposal:

- The high likelihood that the Province will use a Minister's Zoning Order (MZO) for the Bridge Station TOC;
- The types of things that can be included under a MZO (i.e. the location of the community centre and library, the density, and the permitted building heights);
- The need to understand the plans for the Langstaff Community more holistically (i.e. considering the High Tech TOC, the Bridge Station TOC, and the lands outside of the TOC together);
- The benefits of burying the hydro corridor to create more useable land;
- The significant increase in density and reduction in jobs compared to the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan;
- The high likelihood that the Province will propose TOCs at Clark and Royal Orchard Stations;
- The status of the Richmond Hill secondary plan for the High Tech TOC area;

- The uncertainty in regards to how the Bridge Station TOC will proceed;
- The School Boards authority to determine the type, size, and location of the school;
- The importance of integrating the Bridge Station TOC with Markham’s trail system;
- The importance of considering community impacts after the Bridge Station TOC is built;
- The heights of the buildings being proposed in the Bridge Station TOC;
- How to balance density with the principles that make a complete community;
- The importance of the City having a say in the location, and size of the Community Centre, and Library;
- The need to better understand subway capacity;
- Whether the Bridge Station TOC will follow the typical municipal development processes (i.e. will it be presented at a Statutory Development Services Committee Public Meeting);
- The potential of the Bridge Station TOC as a mega transportation hub.

Darryl Lyons, Manager, Policy, clarified that the City will not be able to pass any by-laws that are in contradiction to the MZO. Mr. Lyons noted that staff are seeking clarity from the Province on the process it plans to proceed with in regards to developing the Bridge Station TOC.

Committee spent time reviewing and refining the staff recommendation.

Moved by Mayor Frank Scarpitti

Seconded by Councillor Keith Irish

1. That the report titled “City Comments on Provincial Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community Proposal, (Ward 1)” be received;
2. That the City does not support the Bridge Station Transit Oriented Community (TOC) proposal as currently proposed;
3. That the City request the Province to revise the Bridge Station TOC Proposal to address the matters outlined in this staff report and in particular the following:
 - A. Align the Bridge Station TOC Proposal with the vision of the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan to meet the City of Markham’s objective to

create a complete, vibrant and sustainable community reflective of the City's high planning and development standards;

- B. Comprehensively plan for the entire Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan area including those lands not part of the Bridge Station TOC to address inter-dependencies and related issues such as cost sharing arrangements for parks, civic uses and infrastructure;
- C. Correct the imbalance of land uses by achieving a jobs to residents ratio closer to 1:2 as outlined in the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan and ensure that any agreements require an appropriate amount of employment uses be provided in each phase of the development as a condition before further phases can proceed;
- D. With respect to parkland:
 - 1) Provide a minimum of 6 hectares of parkland in an early phase so it is available and better aligned with the timing of residential development;
 - 2) Confirm that Bridge Park is financially and technically feasible, including confirmation from CN Rail that such a park would be permitted; and,
 - 3) Provide an alternative solution to deliver the minimum required parkland if Bridge Park cannot be constructed;
- E. Provide a minimum of one library at 2,415 m² and one community centre at 4,273 m² to serve the community and confirm that the City of Markham maintains the authority to refine the size and location of the library and community centre;
- F. Demonstrate that the Bridge Station TOC will function as a destination that incorporates a mix of uses (employment, tourism, cultural, retail, recreation, etc.), world class urban design and vibrant public spaces that draw residents and visitors;
- G. Confirm the appropriate location and amount of space required for schools with the York Region District School Board, York Region Catholic School Board, Conseil scolaire Viamonde, and Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir;
- H. Meet the 35% target for affordable housing as established in the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan in consultation with the Region and the City;

- I. Revise the Transportation Plan to comprehensively plan for the entire Richmond Hill Centre/Langstaff Gateway Urban Growth Centre and account for the change in the subway location, significant increase in travel demand from the population increase and reduced opportunity for local travel due to the low ratio of non-residential uses proposed;
 - J. Provide a detailed Phasing Plan that appropriately aligns development with the delivery of subway, transportation, infrastructure and civic uses (such as schools, parks and community amenities);
 - K. Confirm that all buildings will be constructed to a minimum LEED gold/silver (or equivalent standard) and that such minimum LEED standards be included in any agreements;
 - L. Confirm that all buildings will be constructed to incorporate District Energy and protect for the inclusion of automated vacuum waste system (AVAC);
4. That the Province provide details regarding the financial framework for the Bridge Station TOC proposal and confirm that the City's authority to collect Development Charges, Community Benefit Charges and Cash-in-lieu of Parkland will not be infringed upon;
 5. That the Province confirm that the TOC framework and agreements do not preclude the City and/or other landowners from entering into agreements to provide facilities and services within the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan area;
 6. That the Province be advised that the City is continuing to review and discuss the Bridge Station TOC Proposal and may provide further recommendations at a later date;
 7. That the Province be requested to consult with appropriate external agencies, including but not limited to, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, York Region, Canadian National Railway, and 407 ETR;
 8. That the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing be requested to consult with the City of Markham should a Minister's Zoning Order (MZO) be considered for the Bridge Station TOC lands;
 9. That a MZO for the Bridge Station TOC not include provisions regarding subdivision control and site plan control so that the City can deal with local issues through these processes;
 10. That the Province engage in more consultation with the public and the City including stakeholders and develop an open and transparent approach to consultation;

11. That Council direct staff to continue working with the Province and Region to align the vision of the Bridge Station TOC with the Langstaff Gateway Secondary Plan through *Planning Act* implementation tools (e.g. plan of subdivision, site plan) and other mechanisms, including potential agreements with participating parties;
12. That the City Clerk provide a copy of this resolution and report to the Ministries of Infrastructure, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Transportation; and Infrastructure Ontario, as well as York Region, the City of Richmond Hill, City of Toronto, City of Vaughan, York Region District School Board, York Region Catholic School Board, Conseil scolaire Viamonde, Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir, and local MPPs; and,
13. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

4.2 RECOMMENDATION REPORT - REQUEST FOR DEMOLITION OF DWELLING 4638 MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE EAST, THE PINGLE-BROWN HOUSE (WARD 6) FILE NO.: 21 142804 DP (10.0)

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, provided a brief background of the request for demolition of the dwelling at 4638 Major Mackenzie Drive East, and advised that both the Heritage Markham Committee and staff support the demolition of the Pingle-Brown House, subject to the three conditions outlined in staff recommendation.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Don Hamilton

Seconded by Councillor Amanda Collucci

1. That the staff report titled “Request for Demolition of Dwelling, 4638 Major Mackenzie Drive East, Ward 6, The Pingle-Brown House, File: 21 142804 DP”, dated January 24, 2022, be received; and,
2. That Council has no objection to the demolition of the dwelling at 4638 Major Mackenzie Drive East, subject to the following:
 - A. The owner is to advertise the availability of heritage components for salvage prior to demolition;
 - B. The owner is to provide documentation to the City of Markham illustrating the mid-19th century building techniques used during the construction of this building obtained as part of the proposed sensitive demolition; and

- C. The owner is to provide at its cost, an interpretative plaque designed in accordance with the requirements of the “Markham Remembered” program and to arrange its installation in a publicly visible location on the property as part of the future development; and,
3. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

5. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

5.1 DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY ISSUES

Moved by Councillor Alan Ho

Seconded by Deputy Mayor Don Hamilton

That Development Services Committee rise into an in-camera session at 12:50 PM to discuss the following item:

5.1.1 ADVICE THAT IS SUBJECT TO SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE, INCLUDING COMMUNICATIONS NECESSARY FOR THAT PURPOSE [Section 239 (2) (f)] (8.0)

Carried

The Committee consented to this item being brought forward to Council on January 25, 2022, Council meeting.

The Confidential Special Development Services Committee meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM, and Committee did not return to the open session.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The Special Development Services Committee adjourned at 2:20 PM.