

Electronic Development Services Committee Meeting

Minutes

Meeting Number: 24

July 11, 2022, 9:30 AM - 1:00 PM

Live streamed

Roll Call	Mayor Frank Scarpitti	Councillor Reid McAlpine
	Deputy Mayor Don Hamilton	Councillor Karen Rea
	Regional Councillor Jack Heath	Councillor Andrew Keyes
	Regional Councillor Joe Li	Councillor Amanda Collucci
	Regional Councillor Jim Jones	Councillor Khalid Usman
	Councillor Keith Irish	Councillor Isa Lee
	Councillor Alan Ho	Clement Messere, Senior Planner
Staff	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer	John Yeh, Manager, Strategy & Innovation
	Arvin Prasad, Commissioner, Development Services	Laura Gold, Council/Committee Coordinator
	Morgan Jones, Commissioner, Community Services	Lily-Ann D'Souza, Senior Planner
	Stephanie DiPerna, Director, Building Standards	Richard Fournier, Senior Manager, Parks & Open Space Development
	Frank Clarizio, Director, Engineering	Mattson Meere, Senior Planner, Urban Design
	Biju Karumanchery, Director, Planning & Urban Design	Chris Rickett, Director, Economic Development, Culture and Entrepreneurship
	Bryan Frois, Manager of Executive Operations & Strategic Initiatives	Rajeeth Arulanantham, Assistant to Council/Committee
	Joel Lustig, Treasurer	Alex Moore, Senior Manager, Procurement & Accounts Payable
	Ronji Borooah, City Architect	Alice Lam, Director of Operations
	Sabrina Bordone, Manager, Development - Central District	David Plant, Senior Manager of Parks Horticulture & Forestry Division
	Rick Cefaratti, Senior Planner, West District	Soran Sito, Manager of Environmental Engineering
	Darryl Lyons, Senior Manager, Policy & Research	

Stephen Lue, Senior Manager,
Development
Stacia Muradali, Acting Manager,
Development - East

Stephen Corr, Senior Planner, East
District
Carlson Tsang, Senior Planner, East
District

Alternate formats for this document are available upon request

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Development Services Committee convened at 9:32 AM with Regional Councillor Jim Jones in the Chair.

The Committee recessed for lunch from 12:44 to 1:30 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 interests.

3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no minutes from the previous meeting.

4. DEPUTATIONS

The deputation were heard with the respective item.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Moved by Mayor Frank Scarpitti
Seconded by Councillor Karen Rea

That the written submission by Marshall Smith, KLM Planning, regarding the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study Update, be received.

Carried**6. PETITIONS**

There were no petitions.

7. PRESENTATIONS**7.1 MARKHAM ROAD - MOUNT JOY SECONDARY PLAN STUDY: UPDATE (10.4)**

Arvin Prasad, Commissioner of Development Services, advised that this presentation will provide an update on the Markham Road – Mount Joy (MRMJ) Secondary Plan Study, specifically the work completed since the Interim Report and the draft demonstration plan, which were received by this Committee in April of 2021. The presentation today includes an overview of the feedback received from stakeholders and members of the public, revisions to the draft demonstration plan, the results of the technical transportation and municipal servicing modeling, an update of the development applications in the secondary plan area, and the next step to finalize the Secondary Plan Study.

Darryl Lyons, Senior Manager, Policy & Research, introduced the consultants and advised that today's presentation continues the engagement with Council and stakeholders on the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study.

Shonda Wang, SvN Architects + Planners Inc., Jonathan Chai, HDR Inc., Patrick Turner, Counterpoint Engineering, Darryl Lyons, City of Markham, and Stacia Muradali, City of Markham delivered the presentation on the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study Update.

The following deputations were provided on the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study Update:

1. Marshall Smith, KLM Planning, representing 9781 Markham Road Limited Partnership, expressed concern that his client's development application for two mixed use high rise towers, 32 and 27 storeys respectively in height, on the Phase 2 lands at 9781 Markham Road was in alignment with the draft demonstration plan received in April 2021. Mr. Smith advised that his client has been actively involved in the secondary planning process, and had not heard any concerns regarding the application until June 2022. Mr. Smith noted that his client is not content with the three tower configuration shown in the revised demonstration plan. Mr. Smith advised that he looks forward to continuing to work on

refining the demonstration plan to achieve optimal outcomes for the subject lands.

2. Billy Tung, KLM Planning, representing 9781 Markham Road Limited Partnership, advised that he was surprised by the changes shown in the revised demonstration plan, as the configuration for his client's lands had remained the same for some time.
3. Rohan Sovig, Malone Given Parsons Ltd, representing 9900 Markham Road, advised that his client's 2021 development application was well received by staff, and was in alignment with the draft demonstration plan for the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study. Mr. Sovig advised that his client is generally okay with reducing the height of their proposed development to 20 storeys. However, his client does not support the hybrid option of less density being permitted on the northern portion of the subject lands if a GO station at Major Mackenzie is not approved by the Province, as a sufficient amount of density needs to be planned for to obtain approval of the GO station.
4. Adam Layton, Evans Planning, representing 2585231 Ontario Inc., the owners of 9999 Markham Road, requested clarification about arrangements for public access, specifically pedestrians, on the private road and laneway on his client's lands connecting to the proposed pedestrian crossing across the rail corridor. Mr. Layton agreed that the pedestrian crossing across the rail corridor will be a key feature in this area and that the details of the crossing, such as how it is constructed, funded, maintained, and accessed are important. Mr. Layton spoke in support of having a Major Mackenzie GO Station, and inquired how it will affect the signalization of the intersection at Anderson Avenue and Major Mackenzie Drive. Mr. Layton also inquired about the timelines for the sewer upgrades on Markham Road, such as how the project will be phased. Mr. Layton also looked for clarification on whether the capacity of 9,000 people for the northern portion the study area lands includes existing developments that have already been approved and allocated, or if it includes the remaining capacity for these lands.

The Committee discussed the following relative to the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study Update:

General Comments

- Noted that there is an opportunity to develop the area without having a great impact on the existing communities;

Height and Density

- Questioned how strict the City will be in regards to the height restrictions;
- Questioned why permitted heights have decreased, but the population projections have increased;
- Clarified that staff received public feedback that some of the development proposals in this area were too high, noting that staff need to ensure that the land uses are appropriate and do not conflict with the surrounding uses.

Pedestrian Crossing and Greenspace by the west side of the Railway

- Suggested that landowners be spoken to in regards to the conveyance of the green space along the west side of the railway corridor to the City, so that it can be designed and planned for alternative transportation uses;
- Encouraged the landowners to form a landowners group to ensure a consistent approach is applied within the secondary plan area;
- Suggested that something special can be done from a design perspective for the proposed pedestrian crossing, as it brings benefits to both sides of the tracks and supports the concept of a walkable community.

Sanitary Sewer System

- Noted that upgrades to the sanitary sewer system on 16th Avenue have been underway for the last few years, and that this data should be considered in the Study;
- Clarified that new sewers on Markham Road are recommended that will extend to 16th Avenue and connect with the existing sewer system, noting that the timing of the service upgrade is not clear at this time;
- Questioned if existing communities will be impacted by the new developments if the sanitary sewer system is not being updated for some time;
- Clarified that extra flows will be diverted to 16th Avenue rather than flow through Markham Village and that the diversion will occur prior to intensification of the area.

Secondary Plan Buildout Timing

- Questioned the estimated timeline for complete build-out;

- Clarified that the area is anticipated to be fully built out in 20-30 years.

Retail

- Questioned if there is enough retail being planned for in the secondary plan area;
- Clarified that redevelopment is intended to maintain existing retail uses, and that the revised demonstration plan provides for mixed use developments, which will include retail;
- Noted that the long term buildout of the area will vary based on if a Major Mackenzie GO Station is approved.

On Street Parking on Markham Road

- Questioned the portion of Markham Road that would have on street parking, as the narrowing of road may be problematic as traffic is already congested in this area;
- Suggested the impact of the reduction of lanes on other roads needs to be understood;
- Clarified that the portion of Markham Road to include street parking is still to be determined, but it should be an area where the parking will support the land use.

Traffic Congestion

- Questioned how traffic congestion will be managed in the area;
- Advised that York Region is planning to build a rapid bus transit lane on Major Mackenzie Drive, and that the proposed Major Mackenzie GO Station would have a commuter parking lot, which would help address some of the traffic infiltration on Markham Road;
- Suggested that there needs to be more discussion on the road network and its capacity in this area, as there will be a greater reliance on the roads if the Major Mackenzie GO Station is not approved by the Province.

GO Stations

- Suggested that GO station areas need to be planned as a corridor rather than just as a station;

- Suggested that the proposed Major Mackenzie GO Station should be planned to encourage a two-way flow of passengers by designing the station to be a destination;
- Noted that the current transportation networks will not be able to handle intensification if the Major Mackenzie GO Station is not approved;
- Suggested that the City needs to have a plan if the Province does not approve the GO Station;
- Questioned how the double tracks would be built to support 15-minute GO service in this area;
- Supported the phasing in of development if the Major Mackenzie GO Station is not approved by the Province.

Employment

- Questioned if there are plans for office buildings to be built in the secondary plan area;
- Clarified that the demonstration plan is targeting one job per every four people living in the area;
- Noted there is currently limited market interest for office buildings in this area, but that this could change as many businesses like having their offices near GO stations;
- Questioned the anticipated GO train usage given recent employment trends;
- Advised that the employment landscape is changing, but that it is still good planning to create complete communities around transit stations and that it is anticipated that more people will take public transit for affordability reasons in the future.

Cycling and Pedestrian Facilities

- Suggested that separate cycling and pedestrian facilities should be built on Markham Road now rather than later;
- Clarified that Markham Road was only re-built in 2013 and that it still has a significant lifecycle left, and that work is scheduled to be done this year on the existing multi-use pathway (MUP) on the west side of Markham Road by adding cross-rides at driveway and public street crossings. The

proposed interim plan is to build an MUP on the eastside of the road to provide additional space for cyclists.

Affordable Housing

- Suggested that there should be affordable housing close to the GO Station;
- Suggested that purpose built rentals should be integrated into the community, and that there should be planned sites for rental buildings included in the area;
- Noted there should be a strategy for rental housing in this community;
- Questioned how the provincial government could help the City achieve its affordable housing goals in this community;
- Clarified that the new York Region Official Plan will require 35% of new housing units to be affordable within the proposed Mount Joy GO Major Transit Station Area, and that staff are also looking at how inclusionary zoning can help increase the supply of affordable housing in the secondary plan area.

Parkland

- Supported the additional parkland that has been included in the revised demonstration plan;
- Requested the calculation of parkland on school or municipal sites in this area;
- Questioned how much parkland there would be if Mount Joy Creek was covered west of the railway corridor.

Schools

- Questioned if the revised demonstration plan includes vertical schools or schools that are integrated with municipal services, such as a community centre or library;
- Noted that land for traditional schools has been protected in the demonstration plan based on input from the school board, but potential policy direction could support lands being used for vertical or integrated schools in this community;
- Suggested midrise buildings rather than four storey buildings fronting the school and parkland west of Markham Road, as it will make for a better transition from the high rise buildings.

The Committee advised that there is still more work to be done, and issues to be resolved with respect to the MRMJ Secondary Plan Study.

Moved by Councillor Andrew Keyes

Seconded by Regional Councillor Joe Li

1. **That the deputations by Marshall Smith, KLM Panning, Billy Tung, KLM Planning, Rohan Sovig, Malone Given Parsons Ltd., and Adam Layton, Evans Planning, regarding entitled "Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study: Update", be received; and further,**
2. The presentation entitled "Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study: Update" be received.

Carried

8. REGULAR REPORTS - DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY ISSUES

8.1 Bill 109, MORE HOMES FOR EVERYONE ACT, 2022 (10.0)

John Yeh, Manager, Strategy & Innovation, provided a summary of the *More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022* (Bill 109), *Planning Act* amendments, which received Royal Assent on April 14, 2022.

The Committee discussed the following relative to the update on the *More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022* (Bill 109), *Planning Act* amendments:

- Questioned how the delegation of site plan approval will work in practice, noting that Council plays an important role in ensuring that the design of development proposals compliment the character of the existing communities;
- Questioned when the legislation comes into effect, and when the municipality is required to start paying fines for failure to make a decision on a development application within the timelines set forth in the *Planning Act*;
- Questioned if the legislation could be appealed;
- Expressed concern that the City does not have enough Planning Staff to make the decisions within the specified timeframe, and that it may be challenging to hire additional qualified staff due to municipal completion for qualified staff with this expertise;
- Suggested that a “Markham payment schedule” will need to be created to ensure that staff are receiving the information they require to make

decisions within the prescribed deadlines, such as fines or charge backs to agencies that do not provide their feedback within a specified timeline;

- Questioned when the timelines set forth in the *Planning Act* start with respect to making a decision on a zoning by-law amendment, official plan amendment, or site plan application;
- Questioned if the cost of the refunds for failure to make a decision on a development application could be included in the next Development Charges Background Study.

Biju Karumanchery, Director of Planning & Urban Design, advised that Council will still have the opportunity to provide its input and direction to staff throughout the planning process even though the legislation has delegated site plan approval to staff. Mr. Karumanchery noted that the timelines for making a decision on a development applications start from the date the application is deemed complete. Mr. Karumanchery advised that staff will try to complete their work within the timelines set forth in the *Planning Act*.

Claudia Storto, City Solicitor and Director of Human Resources, advised that she could provide advice on whether the City could challenge the legislation in a confidential session. Ms. Storto advised that the legislation for site plan delegation came into effect on July 1, 2022, and that the refunding of development fees comes into force on January 1, 2023.

Moved by Deputy Mayor Don Hamilton
Seconded by Councillor Isa Lee

1. That the report dated July 11, 2022 entitled “Bill 109, More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022” be received.

Carried

8.2 RECOMMENDATION REPORT - ENTERPRISE BOULEVARD INC. APPLICATIONS FOR OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO PERMIT A HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT WITH A MAXIMUM 1,350 RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ENTERPRISE BOULEVARD, IMMEDIATELY EAST OF THE METROLINX-GO STOUFFVILLE RAIL CORRIDOR (WARD 3), FILE NO. PLAN 20 113948 (10.3, 10.5)

Arvin Prasad, Commissioner of Development Services, advised that this item is to recommend the approval of applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments submitted by Enterprise Boulevard Inc. to permit the development of three residential towers consisting of a maximum of 1,350 residential units. Mr. Prasad advised that the proposed development is in alignment with the Development Concept for the Markham Centre Secondary Plan Update that is currently underway.

Maria Gatzios, Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc., provided a presentation on the proposed development.

The Committee provided the following feedback on the proposed development:

- Suggested that this phase of the proposed development should include a pedestrian bridge and pathway to the Unionville Go Station;
- Questioned how the proposed development appears facing Enterprise Boulevard;
- Suggested that the crash wall be carefully designed;
- Suggested that all of the parking spaces should be wired for the possible charging of an electric vehicle in the future, noting that this should be made standard for all developments;
- Requested that a parking ratio of a minimum of 0.6 parking spaces per residential unit and maximum 1.0 parking spaces per residential unit be provided, as unsold parking spaces will drive up the cost of the units;
- Expressed some concern that there would be a shortage of parking in the area if the parking is reduced;
- Noted that public parking would not be permitted in the proposed development;
- Suggested that the pedestrian bridge should be iconic and that public art should interface with Enterprise Boulevard;
- Suggested that there will be no “street parking” along Enterprise Boulevard;
- Questioned how parking spaces were being provided for non-residential uses.

Ms. Gatzios displayed a graphic of how the buildings will look facing Enterprise Boulevard, explaining that you will see glass and part of the building structure,

and that the gym will be behind the exposed glass. Ms. Gatzios advised a decision on the parking ratio for the proposed development needs to be made now, as the project is in the final stages and will soon be brought to market. Ms. Gatzios clarified that four parking spaces for non-residential uses are included in the proposed development.

The Committee asked about the number of parking spaces required versus those sold for comparable developments.

Moved by Mayor Frank Scarpitti

Seconded by Councillor Reid McAlpine

1. That the report titled, “RECOMMENDATION REPORT, Enterprise Boulevard Inc., Applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to permit a high density development with a maximum of 1,350 residential units on the north side of Enterprise Boulevard, immediately east of the Metrolinx-GO Stouffville rail corridor (Ward 3), PLAN 20 113948”, be received; and,
2. That the Official Plan Amendment application submitted by Enterprise Boulevard Inc., be approved and the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix ‘A’, be finalized and brought forward to a future Council meeting to be adopted without further notice; and,
3. That the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Enterprise Boulevard Inc., be approved and the draft Zoning By-law Amendment, attached as Appendix ‘B’, be finalized and brought forward to a future Council meeting to be enacted without further notice; and,
4. That in accordance with the provisions of subsections 45 (1.4) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, the Owner shall through this Resolution, be permitted to apply to the Committee of Adjustment for a variance from the provisions of the accompanying Zoning By-law, before the second anniversary of the day on which the by-law was approved by Council; and,
5. **That a revised residential parking ratio of a minimum 0.6 spaces per unit to a maximum of 1.0 spaces per unit be included in the provisions of the draft Zoning By-Law Amendment; and,**
6. That the application for Site Plan Application (SPC 21 137365) submitted by Enterprise Boulevard Inc. be delegated to the Director of Planning and Urban Design, or a designate, and that Site Plan Approval not be issued prior to the execution of a Site Plan Agreement; and further,

7. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

9. REGULAR REPORTS - TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES

9.1 TENDER 011-T-22 WINTER ROAD MAINTENANCE SERVICES FOR PART A - SINGLE AND TANDEM AXLE AND WINDROW UNITS AND PART B - LOADERS COMMENCING NOVEMBER 2024 (5.10)

Morgan Jones, Commissioner of Development Services, introduced the item, advising that the purpose of the item is to obtain Council approval to award contracts for the winter road maintenance services, for Part A --Single and Tandem Axle and Windrow Unit, and Part B Loaders, commencing in November 2024.

Steve Dollmaier, Senior Manager, Roads & Survey, provided an overview of the report details, including the service delivery model changes, and options. Mr. Dollmaier advised that staff are not proposing a change in the service level, but rather a change in the methodology for providing winter road maintenance based on the patterns of recent winter weather.

The Committee discussed the following relative to the staff report on the Tender for Road Maintenance Service:

- Discussed Part A: Winter Road Services Utilizing Single and Tandem Axle and Windrow Units, Options 1-7;
- Suggested that a modified Option 5 could also be considered that would reduce the cost of increasing the service level and provide an equal service level to residents with and without sidewalks, which would include:
 - increasing the service level plowing from 7.5 cm to 5 cm on local roads without sidewalks;
 - continuing to provide senior windrow removal within the current 8 hour window;
- Requested more detail, and greater clarification on the cost and respective tax rate increase for each option;
- Questioned why the contract was being proposed for 12 years;
- Questioned if the new contract will provide for greater flexibility;

- Expressed some concern in regards to reducing the number of contractors, as it may increase the City's risk if there is an issue with one of the providers.

Staff provided the following responses to inquiries from the Committee:

Joel Lustig, Treasurer, explained that that duration of a contract is based on the lifecycle of the asset, which is 12 years. Mr. Lustig clarified that the winter maintenance equipment is only used during the winter months.

Mr. Jones advised that the new contract will provide Council with greater flexibility to change the winter road maintenance service level at any given time. Mr. Jones clarified that two large very reliable service providers would be responsible for delivering the winter road maintenance under this contract.

Moved by Councillor Andrew Keyes

Seconded by Mayor Frank Scarpitti

1. That the report entitled "Tender 011-T-22 Winter Road Maintenance Services for Part A – Single and Tandem Axle and Windrow Units, Part B – Loaders Commencing November 2024" be received; and,
2. That the contract for Winter Road Maintenance Services for Part A – Single and Tandem Axle and Windrow Units (Option 1) be awarded to the lowest priced bidder, D. Crupi & Sons Limited for twelve (12) winter seasons (November 16, 2024 – April 15, 2036) in the estimated annual amount of \$4,819,862.40 (inclusive of HST); and,
3. That the contract for Winter Road Maintenance Services for Part B – Loaders be awarded to the lowest priced bidder, Melrose Paving Co. Ltd. for twelve (12) winter seasons (November 16, 2024 – March 31, 2036) in the estimated annual amount of \$2,577,917.02 (inclusive of HST); and,
4. That the 2025-2036 operating budgets and (starting in the 2nd winter season) the purchase orders be adjusted for growth and a price adjustment based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for All Items Ontario for the twelve (12) month period ending March 31 in the applicable year up to a maximum of 4%. CPI shall be applied to 100% on the operating rate and 50% on the standby rate; and,
5. That the funds be provided from the various operating budget accounts outlined in the Financial Considerations section in the estimated annual amount of \$7,397,779.42 for the 1st winter season award amounts subject to budget approvals; and,

6. That the estimated budget shortfall of \$1,612,314 be phased in over a 3-year period commencing in 2023 and be included as part of the 2023-2025 operating budgets, subject to Council approval of the 2023-2025 operating budgets ; and,
7. **That staff report back at a future General Committee meeting with more detail on Part A: Winter Road Services Utilizing Single and Tandem Axle Windrow Units, Options 1-7, including the tax rate increase that would be required for each option, and on a modified Option 5, which includes increasing the service level plowing on local roads with no sidewalks and senior windrow removal within the current 8 hour window; and further,**
8. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

9.2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 077-R-22 CITYWIDE PARKING STRATEGY (2.17, 7.12)

Frank Clarizio, Director of Engineering, clarified that the purpose of this item is obtain Council's approval to award a contract to develop a Citywide Parking Strategy. Mr. Clarizio noted that scope of the project includes all of Council's past requests regarding the development of a parking strategy. Mr. Clarizio advised that the strategy will be completed in phases, and that it is targeted to be fully completed by March 2024. Mr. Clarizio explained that staff will provide updates to Council on the progress of the strategy, as part of each phase of the project.

The Committee noted that destinations, such as the Rouge National Urban Park should be included in the Citywide Parking Strategy.

Moved by Councillor Reid McAlpine

Seconded by Councillor Andrew Keyes

1. That the report entitled "Request for Proposal 077-R-22 Citywide Parking Strategy" be received; and,
2. That the contract for the Citywide Parking Strategy be awarded to the highest ranked, lowest priced bidder, WSP Canada Inc. in the amount of \$500,771.14, inclusive of HST; and,

3. That a 10% contingency in the amount of \$50,077.11 inclusive of HST, be established to cover any additional consulting services to deliver the study and that authorization to approve expenditures of the contingency amount up to the specified limit be in accordance with the Expenditure Control Policy; and,
4. That the Engineering Department Capital Administration fee in the amount of \$67,506.94, be transferred to revenue account 640-998-8871 (Capital Administration Fee); and,
5. That the cost in the amount of \$618,355.19 (\$500,771.14 + \$50,077.11 + \$67,506.94) be funded from account 640 101 5399 22051 with budget available of \$566,100; and,
6. That the budget shortfall in the amount of \$55,255.19 (\$618,355.19 - \$566,100.00) be funded from the Non-DC Growth Reserve in the amount of \$42,213.51 and from Development Charges (DC) in the amount of \$10,041.68; and further,
7. That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Carried

10. MOTIONS

There were no motions.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

11.1 NOTICE OF MOTION ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING (10.0)

Moved by Regional Councillor Jack Heath

Seconded by Councillor Reid McAlpine

That rules of procedure be waived and that the follow motion be sent directly to the July 14th, 2022 Council meeting:

WHEREAS, on February 25, 2021, York Region Council adopted the following motion: “That in order to support the acceleration of Affordable Housing in York Region, York Regional Council asks all lower tier municipalities to pass a resolution in support, in principle, of the provision by each municipality either directly or through partnership, of 2 acres of land over the next 5 years for Housing York Inc. or a not-for-profit or for-profit site dedicated to support

affordable housing as deemed appropriate by the municipality, and provide a decision to York Region by May 30, 2021,” and

WHEREAS, the need for affordable housing has never been higher in the GTA than it is today, and

WHEREAS, one of the major issues in regard to housing affordability is the price and availability of land, and

WHEREAS, there are suitable public lands available in the City of Markham, some of which were acquired decades ago, and

WHEREAS, some Markham-owned lands could be available for affordable housing, therefore

1. **BE IT RESOLVED THAT Markham Council, in response to the York Region resolution of February 25, 2021, instruct staff to report back in Q3 2022 on criteria, available lands, and opportunities to partner with Housing York Inc., not-for-profit organizations, or for-profit organizations dedicated to supporting affordable housing.**

Carried

12. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

Regional Councillor Jack Heath asked the Committee to approve Mayor Frank Scarpitti, Councillor Karen Rea, Councillor Collucci, and himself attending the Markham District Energy (MDE) Strategic Retreat, with all expenses to be paid for by MDE.

Moved by Regional Councillor Jack Heath

Seconded by Councillor Reid McAlpine

1. That Council permit Mayor Frank Scarpitti, Regional Councillor Jack Heath, Councillor Karen Rea, and Councillor Amanda Collucci to attend the Markham District Energy (MDE) Strategic Retreat, on July 12 and 13, 2022, with all expenses to be covered by MDE.

Carried

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

14. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Moved by Councillor Isa Lee
 Seconded by Councillor Khalid Usman

That the following in-camera items be referred to the July 14th Council meeting:

T

14.1 DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY ISSUES

14.1.1 LITIGATION OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION, INCLUDING MATTERS BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS, AFFECTING THE MUNICIPALITY OR LOCAL BOARD; (10.3, 10.5) (WARD 8) [SECTION 239 (2)(e)]

14.1.2 LITIGATION OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION, INCLUDING MATTERS BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS, AFFECTING THE MUNICIPALITY OR LOCAL BOARD; (10.3, 10.5) (WARD 1) [SECTION 239 (2)(e)]

14.1.3 PERSONAL MATTERS ABOUT AN IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUAL, INCLUDING CITY OR LOCAL BOARD EMPLOYEES (6.3) (WARDS 1-8) [SECTION 239 (2)(B)]

Carried

15. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Amanda Collucci
 Seconded by Councillor Khalid Usman

The Development Services Committee adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Carried