

From: **Daniela Provenzano**

Date: Sun., Dec. 11, 2022, 4:51 p.m.

Subject: 16 Kirk Dec 12th Development Services meeting submission

To: <clerkspublic@markam.ca>

Good afternoon

I am writing in regards to the 16 Kirk Drive proposal of 5 detached 3-storey homes.

My name is Daniela Provenzano and I live at 20 Thornheights Road.

I would like this written submission to be included in the meeting on Dec 12, 2022 as I am unable to attend virtually.

Firstly I am asking for a delay in approving such proposal as the residents were not formally notified by the Markham Development Services dept. We were only notified by Keith Irish a few days ago.

I do not approve of 5 detached homes at 16 Kirk for the following reasons:

1. The footprint has been shown to be the same as the 8 townhomes proposed last year, which I also opposed.

The footprint will cover more than 50% of the lot, compared to 10% today with the single family dwelling. Setbacks are not in line with existing dwellings and are a mere few meters from the lot lines. The existing homes all have deep setbacks.

2. Additional traffic and bottleneck congestion at Yonge and Kirk will occur, with approximately 10 cars at 5 properties.

Thornheights already has issues with street parking. The proposed 5 homes would only increase the problem.

3. The removal of mature trees and a decrease in green space or grass, which currently absorb rainfall. An increase in asphalt at 5 properties can only increase the rain runoff into the street and cause flood risk to surrounding properties.

4. There will be additional stress to an already stressed old infrastructure. Homes on Kirk were flooded in 2005 and no updates were done to the infrastructure.

5. The future density at Langstaff Gateway has been shown to be more than that of Manhattan. Thornhill will have plenty of density there, as well as with the proposed high rises at Yonge and Royal Orchard. We are encouraging councilors to maintain the character of our area. Five homes of 3 storeys each are not in character in the Kirk area, which is primarily two storey homes or bungalows.

Any new infill homes in the area, such as 8 Thornheights have followed bylaws when building.

6. The new bungalow built at 8 Thornheights has its side yard against the back of 16 Kirk meaning that 8 Thornheights could have 5 homes for neighbours and would be affected by shadowing, noise and lack of any privacy.

6. The approval of such excessive density on one lot at #16 will set a precedent for others to do the same.

Thank you for considering my written submission. I urge you to not approve this development.

Regards
Daniela Provenzano

From: Zhiyong Zhang

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 9:14 PM

To: Councillor, Keith Irish - Markham <KIrish@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Patton, Lauren; winstan

Subject: Re: FW: Forthcoming Recommendation Report: 16 Kirk Drive

Good evening, Keith and the Clerk

First thank you for being responsive to our community's concern.

I'd like to say, this type of application and possible approval will be a big potential issue for the neighborhood. Overall, the community opposed such an application.

1. For the 16 Kirk Drive, just google the address and listen to the voice for the previous proposal to build 8 townhouses.

[Petition · 16 Kirk Drive - Proposed townhouses are changing our neighbourhood · Change.org](#)

Considering this is a community with a vast majority of senior families, this opposition is a very strong one from the neighborhood. I believe the voice should be listened to. It is surprising that the city didn't even let families around know of it. It's very annoying that the city fails to issue a formal notice of this application to the public. This is nothing to recommend\approve if someone just sits in the office and doesn't listen to the community.

2. Kirk Drive is already a busy street. There is no traffic light to go south on Yonge Street. During rush hours, the incoming vehicles back to Kirk Drive from the north and the outgoing vehicles to the south are lining up waiting for traffic. We may travel all the way around to Royal Orchard Blvd to use the traffic light to go south, but we need to pass 2 schools! Royal Orchard Blvd will be even busier in future if more high rise buildings are allowed. I'd conclude that the explosive plan (1 house becomes 5 houses, 1 family becomes 5 families, 1 car now becomes 5 cars in the future) like 16 Kirk Drive proposed will be a disaster for the community. Imagine if it is approved, lots of homeowners might do similar applications and our neighborhood will be ruined.

3. I don't think it is sustainable growth to approve an explosive plan by simply thinking of applying Bill 23.

Let the city answer the questions for Royal Orchard community:

a. Where is the recreation equipment for senior\kids' outdoor activities?

b. Any facilities\playground \ road maintenance has the city invested for taxpayers in the past 10 years?

Just allowing building houses and condos with zero investment for recreation facilities for seniors and children will just create more traffic and congestion. No one believes it will help resolve housing issues, instead it will create problems. There is nothing wrong to apply for whatever plan, but it will be completely wrong to approve a disaster plan since the approver will be the troublemaker. I don't think the city is smart to mention Bill 23 for such a case. Newly developed area has very modern facilities to afford high density buildings but the Royal Orchard community is far from ready for that.

4. Again, my last question is why families around 16 Kirk Drive are not notified to express our views. If my next door neighbor Jane mentioned it to me on the street, I never knew it. This is our neighborhood, and we are supposed to be the decision maker for ourselves. The city and the councilor should consult us before any recommendation is made for a formal process. Please, stop any recommendation as for now and listen to the neighbors first.

Thank you.

James Zhang,

PhD Math UAlberta, MSc UWaterloo

49 Thronheights Rd, Thornhill, L3T 3L9

From: J-C WINSTANLEY

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 12:14 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: 16 Kirk Drive

Dear Sir/Madam, as a resident of 53, Thornheights Road I was surprised to hear of new plans for 16 Kirk Drive. I would have expected official notice from the Town of Markham, new bill boards to inform the community and some time to consider our response. My new neighbour at 49 had no idea.

As it is we heard from someone on Council last week. I do not think that this is correct procedure. Those of us who presented last time and others in the area who walk past should be informed about changes. The current bill boards have been up for a long time – unsightly – and obviously irrelevant. Please email or call me Monday am. Thank you, Jane winstanley
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Ruth Devor

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 3:44 PM

Subject: 16 Kirk Dr.

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.

I am outraged that this project has proceeded without due process from the immediate community. This upcoming meeting should be postponed.

Nothing has changed - the footprint is the same, and the same objections still apply.

This was a deliberate attempt to overlook our concerns, simply to increase density.

Shame on everyone concerned.

Ruth Devor

From: Valerie Burke

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:33 PM

Subject: Item 8.6 - Thornheights Homes Inc.

To the Members of Development Services

Re: Item 8.6 - Thornheights Homes Inc., Application for Zoning By-law Amendment to permit five single detached dwellings at 16 Kirk Drive

Please recommend to the applicant that the windows comply with Markham's bird-friendly guidelines and that outdoor lighting be night-sky compliant. The renderings of the proposed dwellings have extremely large windows and appear to be reflective.

Markham was proudly one of the first municipalities to adopt guidelines to protect our resident and migratory birds. Collisions with glass windows is a leading cause of injury/death to birds. Our global bird populations are in decline. We need to do everything possible to increase biodiversity.

Markham was also the first Monarch-friendly municipality in order to help protect our pollinators. Mitigating the effects of outdoor light pollution is a crucial part of Markham's environmental sustainability since light pollution is very harmful to migratory birds, pollinators, insects and nature in general. Markham's bird friendly guidelines recommends the elimination of up-lighting. Section 6.2.2.6 of Markham's sustainable communities' states "To develop dark-sky guidelines to reduce light pollution to maintain night sky and reduce negative impact of lighting on the nocturnal environment for use as part of the development approval process."

Artificial lighting disrupts the natural circadian rhythms of humans, animals, insects and plants. Light pollution affects the health of humans by inhibiting the production of melatonin, which can cause cancer. Light trespass is unpleasant for neighbouring residents.

It is not too late to make the windows safer and more sustainable for the protection of our birds, pollinators and residents. Night-sky compliant outdoor lighting will also help improve the sustainability and livability of these future homes and neighbouring residents.

Sincerely,

Valerie Burke

From: **Virginia Gorizzan**

Date: Sun., Dec. 11, 2022, 5:06 p.m.

Subject: 16 Kirk meeting on Dec 12 for 5 detached homes

To: <clerkspublic@markam.ca>

Good evening

Please accept this written submission in regards to the Development Services Meeting to be held Mon Dec 12, 2022 at 9:30am.

My submission is for 8.6 on the agenda.... 16 Kirk Drive.

My name is Virginia Gorizzan and I live at 3 Thornheights Road which is the opposite corner of 16 Kirk Drive.

I moved to 3 Thornheights Rd 2 years ago after leaving my 2 storey home of 47 years. My needs required me to live in a bungalow and I love my home and neighbourhood.

I do not approve of 5 three storey detached home at 16 Kirk.

The mature trees in the area were a big attraction for me, an avid gardener. Building 5 homes would cause removal of trees and replace grass with cement and mortar. The rain run-off would be a problem.

The infrastructure here is old and has been the cause of flooding across the street on Kirk in past years. Increasing density would increase the risk of flooding again.

Often times, street parking occurs on Thornheights in front of my home on both sides of the street. This is a concern as Emergency vehicles would have difficulty entering Thornheights, a dead end street. Adding more homes would increase the problem.

Finally the overall character of these homes is not in character with the area which predominantly has 2 or 1 storey homes. Three storey homes are out of character and also do not include accessibility for anyone with mobility issues.

Personally, I will not enjoy looking at a three storey wall opposite my home instead of mature trees.

Please do not approve 5 three story detached homes.

Thank you
Virginia Gorizzan

From: Zhiyong Zhang <zhiyongz@ualberta.ca>

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 9:14 PM

>

Subject: Re: FW: Forthcoming Recommendation Report: 16 Kirk Drive

Good evening, Keith and the Clerk

First thank you for being responsive to our community's concern.

I'd like to say, this type of application and possible approval will be a big potential issue for the neighborhood. Overall, the community opposed such an application.

1. For the 16 Kirk Drive, just google the address and listen to the voice for the previous proposal to build 8 townhouses.

[Petition - 16 Kirk Drive - Proposed townhouses are changing our neighbourhood - Change.org](#)

Considering this is a community with a vast majority of senior families, this opposition is a very strong one from the neighborhood. I believe the voice should be listened to. It is surprising that the city didn't even let families around know of it. It's very annoying that the city fails to issue a formal notice of this application to the public. This is nothing to recommend\approve if someone just sits in the office and doesn't listen to the community.

2. Kirk Drive is already a busy street. There is no traffic light to go south on Yonge Street. During rush hours, the incoming vehicles back to Kirk Drive from the north and the outgoing vehicles to the south are lining up waiting for traffic. We may travel all the way around to Royal Orchard Blvd to use the traffic light to go south, but we need to pass 2 schools! Royal Orchard Blvd will be even busier in future if more high rise buildings are allowed. I'd conclude that the explosive plan (1 house becomes 5 houses, 1 family becomes 5 families, 1 car now becomes 5 cars in the future) like 16 Kirk Drive proposed will be a disaster for the community. Imagine if it is approved, lots of homeowners might do similar applications and our neighborhood will be ruined.

3. I don't think it is sustainable growth to approve an explosive plan by simply thinking of applying Bill 23.

Let the city answer the questions for Royal Orchard community:

a. Where is the recreation equipment for senior\kids' outdoor activities?

b. Any facilities\playground \ road maintenance has the city invested for taxpayers in the past 10 years?

Just allowing building houses and condos with zero investment for recreation facilities for seniors and children will just create more traffic and congestion. No one believes it will help resolve housing issues, instead it will create problems. There is nothing wrong to apply for whatever plan, but it will be completely wrong to approve a disaster plan since the approver will be the troublemaker. I don't think the city is smart to mention Bill 23 for such a case. Newly developed area has very modern facilities to afford high density buildings but the Royal Orchard community is far from ready for that.

4. Again, my last question is why families around 16 Kirk Drive are not notified to express our views. If my next door neighbor Jane mentioned it to me on the street, I never knew it. This is our neighborhood, and we are supposed to be the decision maker for ourselves. The city and the councilor should consult us before any recommendation is made for a formal process. Please, stop any recommendation as for now and listen to the neighbors first.

Thank you.

James Zhang,