

Appendix 1 -

Comment Response Matrix of Feedback on the Draft OPA for the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan

No.	Submission Date	Stakeholder Type	Submission Type	Commenter	Summary of Comment(s)	Staff Response(s)
1	23-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Humphries Planning Group Inc. c/o Meadowpark Investments 77 Anderson Avenue	1. Requested that the zoning bylaw amendment application (ZBLA) for a 45-storey mixed use condominium building on the Subject Lands, which are located within the Mount Joy GO Station Mixed Use Node, be considered for approval prior to the adoption of the Markham Road - Mount Joy ("MRMJ") Secondary Plan, or creation of Developer's Group Agreement(s).	1. Noted - The zoning bylaw amendment application ("ZBLA") application is still under review.
2	23-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Humphries Planning Group Inc. c/o Krashnik Investments Limited 9833 & 9829 Markham Road	<p>1. Commented that previous comments and objections to the proposed distribution of land uses in the Secondary Plan Area have not been addressed.</p> <p>2. Commented that it is premature to seek comments on the draft Secondary Plan policy framework until the Secondary Plan Study reports are publicly available, and requested circulation of the detailed Secondary Plan Study work as soon as possible.</p> <p>3. Expressed concern that Developer's Group Agreement(s) are encouraged, but not required in the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan policy framework.</p> <p>4. Expressed support for mixed use development and higher building heights on school sites as outlined in the staff report, and expressed concern that this does not appear to be reflected in the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan policy framework.</p>	<p>1. The Subject Lands are located in the North Precinct, which as per the community structure policies in the draft Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan "(draft Secondary Plan)" is primarily residential in character with community infrastructure and amenities. More specifically, the Subject Lands are situated between Markham Road and the Stouffville GO Railway Corridor and designated 'Residential High Rise', 'Residential Mid Rise', 'Greenway' and 'Institutional' to implement the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. The public park, greenway system, and public school site identified on the Subject Lands are also based on the recommendations of the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study ("Secondary Plan Study"), which comprehensively analyzed land use and urban design, transportation and municipal servicing to determine what infrastructure and amenities would be needed to support growth in the Secondary Plan Area. As per policy 10.2.1, the new schools and public parks identified on the Subject Lands were incorporated in the draft Secondary Plan without regard to ownership.</p> <p>2. The technical analysis, results and recommendations from the Secondary Plan Study were shared throughout the Study process, and used to inform the preparation of the draft Secondary Plan. An executive summary of the Final Study Report was released in June 2023 and followed by the final reports in September and October 2023.</p> <p>3. Landowners and developers have been encouraged since the outset of the Secondary Plan Study in 2019 to form a Developers Group to support an equitable distribution of costs for community infrastructure and services. Given that the City would not be involved in the Developer's Group, the City can only encourage the formation of a group or agreement between developers.</p> <p>4. Policy 8.6.3 was revised to allow for residential uses in the 'Institutional' land use designation if the residential uses are integrated with a public school in a multi-storey mixed use building.</p>
3	25-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	WND Associates c/o Fouro Towers Builders Ltd. & Sasson Construction Inc. 9331 - 9399 Markham Road	<p>1. Commented that the boundary of the Mount Joy GO Station Mixed Use Node should be expanded to include the Subject Lands.</p> <p>2. Commented that the maximum building heights identified on Map SP3A - Height (i.e., 20 to 25 storeys) are inconsistent with the density identified on Map SP3B - Density (i.e., 7.0 FSI), and noted the Subject Lands can accommodate a taller built form.</p> <p>3. Commented that the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan should not place restrictions on building heights and densities within the Mount Joy GO Major Transit Station Area (MTSA).</p> <p>4. Requested that the draft Secondary Plan be revised to reflect the ZBLA and site plan application for the proposed mixed use building with 37 and 42-storey residential towers.</p>	Note: The Development Application for the Subject Lands was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (Case Number OLT-23-00747).

4	26-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Brutto Consulting c/o The Monopoly Group 158 Anderson Avenue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concern that a portion of the Subject Lands are being redesignated from 'Mixed Use High Rise' to 'Residential Mid Rise', and commented that the 'Mixed Use High Rise' designation should be maintained. 2. Expressed concern that the maximum heights of 20 storeys and three storeys identified on Map SP3A - Height represent an underutilization of the Subject Lands considering its proximity to the Mount Joy GO Station, and the greater height permissions identified on neighbouring lands to the north and south. 3. Expressed concern that the densities of 7.0 FSI and 3.0 FSI identified for the Subject Lands on Map SP3B - Density are the same as the densities identified for adjacent lands with greater height permissions. 4. Commented that the Subject Lands merit maximum greater heights as well as a density of 7.0 FSI across the entire Subject Lands. 	<p>1. to 4. The Subject Lands are located in the Central Precinct along Markham Road, which as per the community structure policies, is intended to accommodate the secondary peak in height and density. The Subject Lands are also situated within the Mount Joy GO Station Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA"), but outside the Mount Joy GO Mixed Use Node which is intended as the primary peak in height and density. The 'Mixed Use High Rise' and 'Residential Mid Rise' land use designations, identified for the Subject Lands are based on the established community structure to guide the pattern of development, particularly peaks and transitions in height and density. The same land use designations are applied on both sides of Markham Road in this area of the Central Precinct. The land use designations on the east side of Markham Road in particular are intended to be consistent with pattern of development approved for the lands to the north. Given recent proposals approved on the lands immediately to the north, as well as the maximum height identified for the lands to the south, the maximum height on the portion of the Subject Lands designated 'Mixed Use High Rise' can be increased from 20- to 25-storeys on Map SP3 - Height and still maintain the intended community structure. There were no revisions to the densities identified for the Subject Lands, however Policy 8.7.2 provides consideration for densities exceeding the FSIs shown on Appendix 2 - Density (formerly Map SP3B - Density) subject to meeting criteria relating to transportation, servicing, urban design and the provision of affordable housing and/or rental housing. Similarly, Policy 8.7.3 provides consideration for additional heights up to 5 storeys above the maximum height shown on Map SP3 - Height on lands designated 'Mixed Use High Rise' within the Mount Joy GO MTSA subject to meeting the same criteria noted in Policy 8.7.2.</p>
5	26-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Islamic Centre of Markham 1330 Castlemore Avenue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concerns that the alignment to reconfigure Mount Joy Creek which includes an open channel adjacent to the railway corridor on the Subject Lands will have a considerable impact on the availability of parking at the mosque. 2. Requested channeling Mount Joy Creek through pipes under Anderson Avenue instead. 	<p>1. and 2. The Subject Lands are located in the North Precinct between Anderson Avenue and the Stouffville GO Railway Corridor. A portion of the Subject Lands is within the Mount Joy Creek floodplain as shown on Map SP5 - Natural Heritage Features. The Secondary Plan Study included the evaluation of five (5) options to reconfigure Mount Joy Creek to address flood hazards and enhance the Greenway System in the northern portion of the Secondary Plan Area. A hybrid option comprising a piped and open channel system adjacent to the railway corridor performed the best in the evaluation and was therefore included in the draft Secondary Plan. As per Policy 4.3.3., future work through a comprehensive study such as a municipal class environmental assessment or equivalent is needed to implement the realignment and possibly daylight a portion of Mount Joy Creek to remove the flood hazard on certain lands in the Secondary Plan Area.</p>
6	26-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Trinity Point Developments (Fouro Towers) 9331 to 9399 Markham Road	<p>1. Mr. DiMartino introduced himself and explained that he was making himself available to address questions, if any, relating to the written comments submitted by WND Associates on behalf of Trinity Point Developments for the lands at 9331 to 9399 Markham Road or Trinity Point's involvement in the Secondary Plan Study process.</p>	<p>Note: The Development Application for the Subject Lands was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (Case Number OLT-23-00747).</p>
7	26-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Kagan Shastri LLP c/o Trinity Point Developments (Fouro Towers) 9331 to 9399 Markham Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requested that the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan policies and mapping that relate to the Subject Lands be revised to permit the development proposed in the revised zoning bylaw amendment and site plan applications filed in March 2022. The proposed development comprises a mixed use building with two towers, 42- and 37-storeys respectively in height, an elevated sky bridge and two new municipal rights of way. 2. Requested that the boundary of the Mount Joy GO Station Mixed Use Node be expanded to include the Subject Lands. 3. Requested that once these changes have been made that the City proceed to approve the MRMJ Secondary Plan. 	<p>Note: The Development Application for the Subject Lands was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (Case Number OLT-23-00747).</p>

8	26-Jun-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Malone Given Parsons c/o Sunny Communities 9900 Markham Road	1. Requested that the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan policies and mapping that relate to the Subject Lands be revised to permit a maximum height of 21 storeys and a maximum density of 7.0 FSI. 2. Requested that site specific policy 9.1 in the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan that provides for additional density if the additional GO Station at Major Mackenzie Drive is approved not be applicable to the Subject Lands.	1. On December 13, 2023, Markham Council adopted official plan and zoning bylaw amendment applications to permit a development consisting of two 21-storey buildings and four four-storey buildings with an overall density of 3.56 FSI on the Subject Lands. The maximum height on the portion of the Subject Lands designated for 'Residential High Rise' uses was therefore revised from 20- and 15-storeys, respectively, to 21-storeys on Map SP3 - Height to be consistent with Council's decision. The draft Secondary Plan takes a permissive approach to density; the approved density of 3.56 FSI is generally consistent with the density of 3.5 FSI identified on Appendix 2 - Density (formerly Map SP3B - Density) and therefore no changes were made to the map. 2. Area and Site Specific Policy 9.1 was deleted and Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use was revised to remove the corresponding hatching to be consistent with the development approved by Council.
9	26-Jun-23	Resident	Deputation	R. Thacker	1. Commented on the cycling infrastructure proposed in the draft MRMJ Secondary Plan, and cited concerns about the safety of providing cycling facilities on a shared roadway.	1. The draft Secondary Plan provides direction to achieve separated cycling facilities (e.g., cycle track, or buffered bike lane) on designated collector roads. Bike lanes are provided on roads where conditions are assessed to be appropriate based on exposure, volume and speed. Where bike lanes are provided on roads, they are designed to be buffered (separated) from vehicular lanes as much as possible; deflectors may also be installed. The Transit and Active Transportation policies as well as other policies in Section 7.1 Transportation System, such as policies pertaining to Vehicle Parking Rates and Transportation Demand Management, are intended to work together to decrease dependence on the automobile.
10	24-Jul-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Markham District Energy	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Markham District Energy has no comments.	1. Noted.
11	24-Jul-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Rogers Communications	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Rogers Communications has no comments.	1. Noted.
12	25-Jul-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Bell	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Bell has no comments.	1. Noted.
13	26-Jul-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Alectra Utilities	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Alectra Utilities has no comments.	1. Noted.
14	31-Jul-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Enbridge	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Enbridge has no comments.	1. Noted.
15	31-Aug-23	Prescribed Body	Email	York Catholic District School Board	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that the York Catholic District School Board has no comments.	1. Noted.
16	12-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Canada Post	1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Canada Post has no comments.	1. Noted.
17	15-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Letter	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	1. Policy 4.3.3 - TRCA is generally supportive of Policy 4.3.3, subject to the following revised policy wording. These modifications are proposed to ensure that appropriate objectives and requirements for the realignment of the tributary area included in the Secondary Plan. “That a comprehensive study to implement the realignment and potentially daylight to the greatest extent possible (there shall be no net loss of open channel length) a portion of Mount Joy Creek, such as a class a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment or equivalent, shall be completed in consultation with to the satisfaction of the City, TRCA, and all other stakeholders and in compliance with applicable guidelines and standards to address: a) current tableland flood remediation (removal of tableland flooding); b) safe conveyance of the Regional storm event plus a freeboard and demonstration of no adverse flood or erosion impacts on upstream or downstream properties; c) natural channel design and naturalized plantings to accommodate wildlife movement, to the extent feasible; d) where the channel corridor will be open, that the channel block includes the required 10 metre buffer to buffers to natural hazards to the satisfaction of TRCA and the City; and, e) comprehensive grading strategy that provides a stable grade transition from the open channel sections to adjacent development lands and Metrolinx's railway.”	1. The intent of Policy 4.3.3 is to provide direction to undertake a comprehensive study to implement the realignment of Mount Joy Creek. Some of the recommended revisions were incorporated into the policy, while others that were considered too technical at the secondary plan level were not (i.e., freeboard, buffer size and grading strategy). The reference to “potentially daylight” was moved from the first sentence of the policy to itemized list, to keep the focus on the comprehensive study. Text was also added to item c) in the bulleted list encouraging a net gain of open channel length. Additional bullets were also added to the policy to capture the intent of the revisions recommended by TRCA, and provide direction to meet regulatory requirements as well as other applicable guidelines and standards. It is also noted that earlier discussions contemplated a 6 metre access allowance instead of a full 10 metre buffer. As such, it is recommended that the buffer width be determined through the comprehensive study instead of being specified in the policy. Further revisions were also made to group similar ideas, and simplify the policy.
17		Prescribed Body	Letter	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Cont'd	2. Policy 4.5.2 - TRCA is generally supportive of Policy 4.5.2, subject to the following revised policy wording. These modifications are proposed as it is currently unclear if the tributary realignment will address the remediation of all spills or if additional remediation is required (e.g., additional remediation may be necessary in the vicinity of 9900 Markham Road / Markham Road and potentially other areas). “That the limits of hazardous lands and hazardous sites in the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan catchment area be delineated to the satisfaction of the City, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and relevant stakeholders. Flood hazards associated with the existing alignment of Mount Joy Creek located outside of the 'Greenway' designation are intended to be comprehensively addressed and mitigated through works identified in Section 4.3.3 and additional site-specific flood plain remediation works, as necessary. Until the realignment of Mount Joy Creek and flood plain remediation works are implemented, development, redevelopment and site alteration shall be prohibited in flood-related hazardous lands, as shown on Map SP5 – Natural Heritage System, in accordance with Section 3.4 of the Official Plan.”	2. The recommended revisions were incorporated into Policy 4.5.2 in addition to revisions made by staff to clarify the intent of the policy.

17		Prescribed Body	Letter	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Cont'd	<p>3. Policy 4.5.2 and Mapping - Policy 4.5.2 and Maps SP1 to SP7: While TRCA supports Policy 4.5.2 subject to the revised policy wording above, the schedules associated with the Secondary Plan need to clearly outline where encumbered lands within the flood plain are located for greater transparency to the users of the Secondary Plan (see example below).</p> <p>4. Map SP5 - Map SP5 shows a realignment of Mount Joy in yellow however Map SP4 Greenway system has the section as separate from the NHS. Given the realignment in the Secondary plan, Map SP4 should be updated to place the "other Greenway lands" into the Greenway System Boundary and Natural Heritage Network.</p> <p>5. Policy 4.1.8 - Section 4.1.8 "To minimize and mitigate" should be revised to be "To avoid, minimize, and mitigate..."</p> <p>6. Policy 4.1.9 - Section 4.1.9 c) "Enhancement opportunities" should be revised to "Enhancement and restoration opportunities and objectives."</p> <p>7. Schedule E, F, G & L - It appears Schedule E, F, G & L do not have the permanent streams and intermittent streams connected to one another across Castlemore Avenue and north. The watercourse lines should be revised to be connected.</p> <p>8. Mount Joy Creek Realignment - The realignment of Mount Joy Creek towards the railway can potentially result in conflict of uses if or when Metrolinx expands the railway in this area. It would be beneficial to determine long term plans of this rail track in order to locate the realigned creek with enough distance to ensure it does not pose a hazard risk to future infrastructure.</p> <p>9. Mount Joy Creek Realignment - It is understood that detailed design materials for the Mount Joy Creek are to be provided as part of the future Environmental Assessment process. We recommend further consultation with TRCA regarding channel design matters (e.g., kick off meeting to discuss the scope and requirements for the EA reports/plans) to help ensure a smooth review process.</p>	<p>3. As per Policy 4.5.2, flood-related hazardous lands within the Secondary Plan Area are shown on Map SP5 – Natural Heritage Features to illustrate where development, redevelopment and site alteration are prohibited until the realignment of Mount Joy Creek and flood plain remediation works are completed. Map SP5 has been revised to include the in-effect screenline and floodplain information, which was not available when the draft map was originally prepared, and clarify that the "Potential re-alignment of Mount Joy Creek / valleylands" is subject to Policy 4.3.3.</p> <p>4. Map SP4 - Greenway System was updated to include the potential realignment of Mount Joy Creek as shown on Map SP5 - Natural Heritage Features as the 'Other Greenway System Lands including certain naturalized stormwater management facilities'.</p> <p>5. The recommended revision was not made as the need for the required infrastructure referred to in Policy 4.1.8 would have been determined in accordance with Policy 3.1.2.9 in the 2014 Official Plan (i.e., where the need for infrastructure in the Natural Heritage Network is demonstrated and no reasonable alternative is available...) and therefore could not have been avoided.</p> <p>6. The recommended revisions were incorporated into Policy 4.1.9 c).</p> <p>7. The linework for permanent streams and intermittent streams was revised to show connectivity across Castlemore Avenue on Schedules E, F, G, & L.</p> <p>8. Noted – to be confirmed through the future comprehensive study.</p> <p>9. Noted - to be confirmed through the future comprehensive study.</p>
18	18-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Letter	Metrolinx	<p>1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that Metrolinx has no specific comments, and provided information about the market-driven process for new GO stations.</p>	<p>1. Noted – staff met with Metrolinx staff multiple times throughout the Secondary Plan Study process to learn more about the market-driven process for new GO stations.</p>
19	21-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Email	CN	<p>1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that CN is no longer the owner of the rail corridor adjacent to the limits of the Secondary Plan Area, and recommended reaching out to Metrolinx, the new owner and operator for comments.</p> <p>2. The response also stated that CN follows the guidelines for developments in proximity to railways, developed by the Railway Association of Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and included attachments with recommendations which may help to guide the municipality with the proposed land use planning and compatibility issues with railway operations within the Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>1. Metrolinx responded to the request for comments on the draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating they do not have comments.</p> <p>2. Comments provided by Metrolinx during the Study referred to Transport Canada Guidelines for Grade Crossing Standards. The Transport Canada Guidelines were considered through the transportation component of the Study, and informed policy directions and recommendations that were used to prepare the draft Secondary Plan. Metrolinx also confirmed that Metrolinx's Adjacent Development Guidelines are essentially the same as those by the Railway Association of Canada, and Federation of Canadian Municipalities which were cited by CN. Policies in Section 4.5 Environmental Hazards were augmented to provide further direction about air quality and/or noise and vibration studies and requirements for the development of sensitive uses adjacent to the GO Railway Corridor.</p>
20	21-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Email	TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.	<p>1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that TransCanada Pipelines has no comments.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
21	21-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Email	Ministry of Transportation	<p>1. Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that the Ministry of Transportation has no specific comments related to the Draft Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>2. The response also stated that the Ministry has jurisdiction within a 396 m circle of the Hwy 48/Major Mackenzie intersection, and requested, once the design work is initiated, submission of the design, Traffic Impact Study, Drainage Report and illumination plan to MTO for review and approval. Once MTO approves the submitted design and reports, developers can apply to the Ministry for permits.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p>
22	27-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region District School Board	<p>Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that:</p> <p>1. There is insufficient capacity in existing local area schools to serve the Secondary Plan Area, and that the school board continues to require additional elementary school site(s).</p> <p>2. The location and distribution school sites in the Secondary Plan Area are generally acceptable.</p> <p>3. The YRDSB's standard for a school site in a high density community is five acres, but the Board is open to exploring the potential reduction in the school site size subject if appropriate agreements and commitments are in place.</p> <p>4. The school sites will not be required in the initial phase of development, and the phasing plan for the Secondary Plan Area should consider how the delivery of school sites will be coordinated with development.</p>	<p>1. The draft Secondary Plan identifies two public school sites on Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use as recommended in the Final Study Report of the Secondary Plan Study.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Public school sites will be confirmed and secured through the development approval process.</p>

23	27-Sep-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Brutto Consulting c/o 21134018 Ontario Inc. 158 Anderson Avenue	<p>1. Submitted similar comments to those from June 2023 regarding the land use direction in the draft Secondary Plan for the Subject Lands that would redesignate a portion of the Subject Lands from 'Mixed Use High Rise' to 'Residential Mid Rise', and set corresponding maximum heights of 20 storeys and three storeys.</p> <p>2. Commented that the proposed land use designation, height and density identified for the easterly portion of the Subject Lands is inconsistent with the minimum density of 200 people and jobs for the Mount Joy GO MTSA mandated by the Region.</p> <p>3. Requested that the proposed land use designations, maximum heights and densities identified for the Subject Lands in the draft Secondary Plan be revised to permit two 36 storey towers on the Subject Lands to reflect the highest and best use of the lands.</p>	<p>1. and 3. See responses to Submission 4 above.</p> <p>2. The anticipated density of the Mount Joy GO Station MTSA at build out is 500 people and jobs per hectare which exceeds the minimum density identified in the 2022 York Region Official Plan (YROP).</p>
24	29-Sep-23	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region	<p>Responded to the request for comments on the Draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan indicating that: York Region Official Plan 2022</p> <p>1. The proposed Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan generally conforms with the 2022 York Region Official Plan. It conforms with policy 4.4.5 as the planned growth is consistent with: the Region's intensification hierarchy; existing and/or planned transit; water, water-wastewater and road infrastructure capacities, and the provision of /access to local parks, schools, and other social, cultural, and commercial services.</p> <p>2. The Secondary Plan conforms with YROP 2022 policy 4.4.11, which states: <i>"That local municipalities shall develop local municipal intensification hierarchies and identify minimum density and height targets for strategic growth areas in a manner that is consistent with the Regional intensification hierarchy."</i></p> <p>3. The Secondary Plan conforms with YROP 2022 policy 4.4.21, which states that a minimum of 35% of new housing within Regional Centres and major transit station areas be affordable.</p> <p>4. The Secondary Plan conforms with YROP 2022 policy 4.4.24, and contains policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify York Region's minimum density targets • identify minimum heights and densities • identify the planned population and jobs • include a range of residential and commercial land uses, including retail uses, office, mixed-use, human services and other amenities • permit a range of unit sizes and housing and tenure options, and employment uses • identify a fine-grained street grid that incorporates sidewalks and cycling facilities • address vehicular and active transportation connections between sites and shared access • address an urban built form that is massed, designed and oriented to people, and creates active and attractive streets for all seasons with ground-floor uses such as retail, human and personal services • include staging and phasing policies and/or plans that sequence development in an orderly way, coordinated with water, wastewater, and transportation capacity, residential/non-residential development thresholds, the provision of human services, community facilities, and other infrastructure. 	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p>
		Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>5. The Secondary Plan has the potential to significantly add a high level of growth, and YROP 2022 policy 4.4.25 is of particular importance. Policy 4.4.25 states: <i>"That approval of secondary plans and/or development within strategic growth areas shall be contingent on the availability of existing or planned infrastructure and other services and be consistent with the Regional intensification hierarchy outlined in policy 4.1.3. York Region may require phasing of development on the basis of the capacity of water, wastewater and/or transportation and transit systems, and/or the timing of required infrastructure. York Region may also require the coordination of development applications to ensure an orderly, coordinated and phased approach to development and the provision of transportation, transit, water, wastewater and other infrastructure."</i> The Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan, together with the 2014 Markham Official Plan, contain appropriate policies for the efficient staging and phasing of development while ensuring appropriate infrastructure is available to accommodate the planned growth.</p>	<p>5. Noted.</p>

24	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>Water and Wastewater Servicing</p> <p>6. Infrastructure and Asset Management (IAM) recommends rewording Section 7.2.3.1 to ... "That a functional servicing report shall be submitted in support of a development application for review and accepted by the City and Region, prior to approval of the development."</p> <p>7. IAM recommends rewording Section 7.2.3.3 to ... "That the functional servicing report address, but not be limited to, lot grading, sewer and watermain works, road cross sections and utility requirements. Engineering drawings are to be prepared in accordance with this report and shall be submitted for review and approval by the City and Region. All municipal services shall be designed in accordance with the policies, guidelines, and standards of the City, and where applicable, relevant approval agencies."</p> <p>8. The Draft Secondary Plan proposes significantly higher growth than considered in the 2022 Regional Official Plan and Water & Wastewater Master Plan. As such, the potential impact of the proposed growth on the Region's water and wastewater infrastructure has not been assessed or considered in the context of the cumulative impact of planned and approved growth both upstream and downstream of the Secondary Plan area. The phasing policies proposed in the Draft Secondary Plan will be an important tool to help align the pace of growth with available servicing capacity in the City and Regional infrastructure system.</p> <p>9. The Region also looks forward to the further coordination between City and Region staff as the Mount Joy Master Environmental Servicing Plan is advanced.</p> <p>10. York Region is developing a Terms of Reference for Functional Servicing Reports (FSR) to be used by all municipalities within York Region. The document identifies the appropriate technical components, standards to be met, and items to be addressed in the study. This will be provided to the City as soon as possible upon finalization.</p>	<p>6. The policy was reworded as recommended.</p> <p>7. The policy was reworded as recommended.</p> <p>8. Noted.</p> <p>9. Noted - the draft Final Municipal Servicing Report was circulated to York Region on October 23, 2023.</p> <p>10. Noted.</p>
24	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>Water Resources</p> <p>11. Water Resources does not have any objections/concerns as it relates to Source Protection policy. Please note that there are Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) designated areas within the Secondary Plan boundary. Please note any development within these areas should reference the associated policies /requirements within Markham's Official Plan.</p>	<p>1. Noted - Policy 4.3.1 in the Draft Secondary Plan provides direction regarding the protection of ground and surface water quality and quantity as per the policies in Section 3.3 of the 2014 Official Plan.</p>
24	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>Transportation</p> <p>12. Local Street 7 seems too close to the 16th Avenue rail-crossing to support a future grade separation. Section 8.9 (Road-Rail Grade Separations) notes that Metrolinx requires a 30 metre setback of driveways or roadways from the rail corridor. The study should clarify if grade separation with a 30 metre setback can be achieved and if future study of additional setback requirements are required for implementing grade separation structures.</p> <p>13. The Region reserves the right to modify or close the Local Street 7 access onto 16th Avenue in the future should it be required to accommodate a future grade separation in the event that a 30 metre setback is inadequate for adjacent streets. It is recommended that the Transportation Study/Secondary Plan include text for the Local Street 7 alignment and setback be subject to further study of any potential road-rail grade separation, which should identify potential future access restrictions / modifications to accommodate any future grade separation.</p>	<p>12. The Secondary Plan Study meets Metrolinx's setback requirements for grade separation. Comments provided by Metrolinx during the Secondary Plan Study referred to Transport Canada Guidelines for Grade Crossing Standards. The Transport Canada Guidelines were considered through the transportation component of the Secondary Plan Study, and informed policy directions and recommendations that were used to prepare the draft Secondary Plan. Specifically, Policy 7.1.2.5 in the draft Secondary Plan provides direction for protecting for rail-road grade separations, including working with Metrolinx and York Region to confirm opportunities for grade separation projects in the Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>13. The alignment for Local Street 7 will be confirmed through the development approval process. Policy 7.1.2.5 was revised to specify that future study is needed to identify potential future access restrictions / modifications to facilitate any future grade separation.</p>
	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>14. It is noted that the previous comments provided were not fully addressed. The previous comments are repeated with additional clarification inside brackets:</p> <p>a. Pg 9, Section 2, mentions that this document relies on the Transportation Plans found in other provincial and regional plans. Specifically relating to the following two projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid transit on Major Mackenzie Drive connecting the study area westerly to the Cities of Richmond Hill, Vaughan, and Brampton • Grade separation of the Major Mackenzie Drive at the Stouffville GO rail line. [Revision details appear to have been incorrectly made to another project ("A potential GO station ..."). Text needs to be added under "Grade separation ..." Please remove regional references from the potential GO station. <p>While it is appropriate to indicate that these two Regional improvements are identified in longrange Regional Transportation Documents, our comment is that clarification should be provided that indicates that these two improvements are not currently identified in the Region's 2023 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction program and should not to be expected to commence within the 2033 horizon year. Furthermore, it should also be noted that Environmental Assessments have not been initiated for these projects and that the Grade separation project requires prioritization from Metrolinx. Moreover, as this report provides a preliminary analysis for the 2041 horizon year, the report should consider advising other processes that will determine the timing and scheduling of these projects, so that it should not be assumed that these projects will be completed for the 2041 horizon year.</p> <p>b. Pg 11 (now 12), Figure 3-2, the ROW for 16th Avenue should be 43m [Figure shows 45m – please revise].</p>	<p>14. Noted - These comments refer to the Final Transportation Report that was prepared as part of the Secondary Plan Study, and informed the preparation of the draft Secondary Plan. Policy 10.3.2 in the draft Secondary Plan provides direction to coordinate development with the delivery of infrastructure in accordance with the York Region 10-year capital plan, Water and Wastewater Master Plan and Transportation Master Plan.</p>

24	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>Public Health</p> <p>15. Section 2 (Goals, Objectives and Principles for a Healthy and Resilient Community) - Suggest including language on the importance of developing age-friendly communities. Suggest including language on local sustainable food systems as one of the elements to support healthy and resilient communities.</p> <p>16. Section 4.2 (Urban Forest System) - YRPH recommends including the following additions in red: The Urban Forest System includes all wooded areas, individual trees, and the soils that sustain them on public and private property. The urban forest provides a number of environmental and health benefits which contribute to the quality of life for residents and workers in the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Area, improved physical and mental health, improved air and water quality, carbon sequestration, climate regulation, flood control, energy efficiency and wildlife habitat. The City will work with development proponents and community groups to increase tree canopy coverage.</p> <p>17. Section 4.5 (Environmental Hazards) - The Secondary Plan explains that this section deals with human environmental hazards resulting from soil contamination and air and noise pollution which can pose a threat to public health and safety. Air quality policies are missing from this section. YRPH recommends adding policies in section 4.3.1 for when an air quality study would be required for applications for development approval e.g., for sensitive land uses adjacent to a major road in the Secondary Plan. This is to support YROP policies 2.3.28, 2.3.29, 2.3.30.</p> <p>18. Section 5.2 (Community Infrastructure and Services) - YRPH recommends including the following additions in red: Community infrastructure and services should be located and designed to act as "community hubs" and focal points within the Markham Road - Mount Joy Community. These "community hubs" may consist of facilities and services provided by the City or York Region such as public schools, parks, open spaces, urban gardening opportunities, libraries and/or community centres, and/or facilities and services provided by the private sector such as day care centres and places of worship.</p> <p>19. Section 5.2 (Public Schools) - Suggest including language on ensuring that public schools are sited, planned and well-integrated into an active transportation network to encourage active travel for the school community</p> <p>20. Section 6.2 (Sustainable Development) - YRPH recommends including the following additions in red: To achieve sustainable development, policy direction is provided with respect to conservation of environmental resources, energy efficiency and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and supporting climate change mitigation and adaptation. Sustainable building and site design within the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Area will focus on water efficiency, energy conservation and renewable energy generation, ecological protection and enhancement, food production and active transportation at the site scale.</p> <p>21. Section 7.1.3 (Transit and Active Transportation Network) - Suggest including recommendation for protected bicycle facilities to help enhance safety and encourage cycling.</p>	<p>15. The preamble text was revised as recommended. Two new policies were also added to promote the development of an age-friendly community with regard to the City of Markham's Age-Friendly Guidelines, specifically Policies 5.3.5 and 6.1.25.</p> <p>16. The policy was revised as recommended with one modification. The modification replaced "flood control" with "stormwater run-off reduction".</p> <p>17. A new policy providing direction for when an air quality impact study would be needed was added to Section 4.5.</p> <p>18. Section 5.2 preamble was revised as recommended.</p> <p>19. Policy 5.2.4 was revised as recommended.</p> <p>20. Policy 6.2 preamble was revised as recommended.</p> <p>21. Policy 7.1.3.3 c) provides direction to prioritize separated and protected cycling facilities in the active transportation network.</p>
24	Prescribed Body	Letter	York Region Cont'd	<p>Natural Heritage Review</p> <p>1. Recent changes imposed through Bill 23 (O. Reg 596/22) prohibit the Conservation Authorities to comment on behalf of municipalities for Natural Heritage reviews outside of the regulated area as part of a Planning Act application submission. However, since the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) regulates land use activities in and adjacent to wetlands, watercourses and valleylands under O. Reg 166/06, through our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), York Region relies on the expertise of the TRCA regarding matters associated with its regulatory requirements.</p> <p>2. Provincial and municipal natural heritage policy matters are being addressed by the applicable provincial and municipal authorities. In a letter dated September 15, 2023 to the City of Markham, the TRCA provided comments with respect to the realignment of Mount Joy Creek. In addition to some suggested revised policy wording, they state that detailed design materials for the Mount Joy Creek are to be provided as part of the future Environmental Assessment process.</p> <p>3. In accordance with Section 17(22) of the Planning Act, once Markham Council adopts the Amendment, the Amendment shall be submitted to York Region for approval.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted - See Item 17 above for TRCA's comments as well as responses from Markham staff.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p>

25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road	<p>Amendments to Markham Official Plan (2014)</p> <p>1. Policy 9.3.6 and associated Figure, Amendment to Map 14 - The proposed Amendment seeks to illustrate the location of a 'park site' within a future phase of the proposed development of the subject property. While it is acknowledged that the location of a future park has been previously discussed with City Staff, we have concerns regarding the suggestion of a specific area and shape within Figure 9.3.6 prior to the submission of applications for said future phase. We also note that the Secondary Plan includes policies related to the creation of a Master Parks Agreement which could further impact the size and configuration of any future parks. Accordingly, we suggest that the proposed Figure be revised to simply indicate a general location of a park, subject to future determination through a development application and/or Master Parks Agreement. Additionally, we request clarification regarding how the provision of parkland shown in the Secondary Plan has been calculated. Are the areas shown reflective of the existing City Parkland By-law, or on the basis of the legislated maximum rates which are in force as per Bill 23?</p> <p>2. Policy 9.3.7.2 - Given the potential for a new GO Station north of Major Mackenzie Drive, we suggest that the description of the Secondary Plan Area should include reference to the potential for future expansion to accommodate same.</p> <p>3. Maps 1, 2, and 3 - We object to the redesignation of the property from 'mixed use' to 'residential' and request that permissions for non-residential uses be retained for the subject property within the Secondary Plan and MOP.</p> <p>4. Greenway System/Natural Heritage Network/Valleyland/Mapping - As part of the above referenced applications, the extent of the natural features on the subject property have been studied and delineated. We request that the extent of the Greenway System shown on all mapping be updated to demonstrate these limits as implemented through site-specific Zoning By-law amendment 2019- 139, and the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision (19TM-18007). Additionally, we request that all mapping be revised to reflect that the final use of Block 5 on the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision remains subject to further study to determine its ultimate use and will be appropriately zoned as part of a future process. Accordingly, the potential that this Block may be used for residential purposes should be reflected in the MOP.</p>	<p>1. The intent of the amendments to Policy 9.3.6 and the associated figure, and Map 14 in the 2014 Official Plan is to align them with the draft Secondary Plan policies in Section 8.5 pertaining to the identification and location of public parks, as such no revisions were made. Refer to Sections 2.7.5 and 6.4.2 in the Final Study Report for a discussion of how the amount of parkland identified in the Secondary Plan Area was calculated. The total area of existing / secured (1.24 ha) and proposed (9.05 ha) parkland identified in the Secondary Plan Area is approximately 10 ha. As per the June 26, 2023 staff report due to the changes introduced by the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 (Bill 23), the total parkland anticipated to be secured is between 8.0 and 9.0 hectares, and results in a shortfall of less than one hectare of the proposed parkland in the Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>2. The lands north of Major Mackenzie Drive East are currently outside the City's urban boundary, and there are no policies or land use designations proposed in the draft Secondary Plan that would apply to these lands. Work to bring the lands north of Major Mackenzie Drive East into the City's urban boundary in conformity with the 2022 YROP will be undertaken through the City's Official Plan Review.</p> <p>3. See response to item 22. below.</p> <p>4. Greenway System limits were reviewed against the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision (19TM-18007) and found to be consistent, as such no updates were made to extent of the Greenway System shown on the draft Secondary Plan mapping. Block 5, in the Draft Plan of Subdivision is currently shown as Open Space and adjacent to Mount Joy Creek. The Block is designated as 'Greenway' on Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use, and based on updated mapping provided by TRCA, is within the Mount Joy Creek floodplain.</p>
25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>5. Mobility - While promoting electric vehicle charging locations is a laudable goal, it would seem to conflict with the intent to promote walking, transit, and cycling as alternatives to automobile use, and would also negatively impact traffic operations within the area. An electric vehicle is, after all, still a vehicle that takes up space on roads, and requires parking. We suggest that given the transit accessibility of the area, potentially to be further strengthened by a second GO Station and future transit corridor along Major Mackenzie Drive, the Secondary Plan should strive to minimize parking requirements (including visitor parking), and introduce sufficient densities and mix of uses such that it is feasible to eliminate the need for automobiles altogether.</p> <p>6. Community Structure - North Precinct - We object to the redesignation of the property from 'mixed use' to 'residential' and request that permissions for non-residential uses be retained for the subject property within the Secondary Plan. Additionally, we request that all mapping be revised to reflect that the final use of Block 5 on the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision remains subject to further study to determine its ultimate use and will be appropriately zoned as part of a future process. Accordingly, the potential that this Block may be used for residential purposes should be reflected in the MOP.</p>	<p>5. The draft Secondary Plan provides for multi-modal options to encourage and facilitate the transition from a car-dependent community to one where taking transit, and cycling or walking are equally considered. This mode shift is anticipated to occur over the long-term as the necessary supporting infrastructure and facilities are implemented. Refer to Section 7.1.4 in the draft Secondary Plan for the policy direction regarding the vehicle parking rate.</p> <p>6. See the responses to items 3. and 4. above.</p>

25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>7. Parks System (Section 3.1.8) - See our comments above related to the size, configuration, and location of the future park contemplated on the subject property. We suggest that the Secondary Plan consider all means of achieving an appropriate level of parkland for the study area, including through the inclusion of stratified parks and privately owned, public spaces (POPS) within the master parks plan and/or Parks Agreement. These types of parks have the potential to contribute to developing the unique sense of place and character for the Study Area and individual development sites therein. We further suggest that partial credit for parkland contribution should be provided by City for the provision of these alternative parkland areas (as has been done in other areas of the City such as Markham Centre). We request clarification regarding how the provision of parkland shown in the Secondary Plan has been calculated. Are the areas shown reflective of the existing City Parkland By-law, or on the basis of the legislated maximum rates implemented through Bill 23?</p> <p>8. Greenway System - We request confirmation of Staff that the extent of the Greenway System on the subject property which has been delineated and appropriately Zoned is accurately reflected on all mapping, and that no further dedications are anticipated to be necessary. Kindly also refer to our prior comments above related to Block 5 on the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision.</p> <p>9. Mount Joy Creek EA - We request clarification from the City with respect to who the proponent of the required Class EA will be. Recognizing that a small proportion of the Secondary Plan area is impacted by the Creek, and that our Client has already undertaken channel redesign and remediation works on its property, is it anticipated that some or all participants in a Landowners Group (LOG) would undertake this work, or merely front-end finance it? Additionally, please confirm that the portion of Mount Joy Creek that is proposed to be piped east of the extension of Anderson Avenue will not impact the lands comprising Phase 1A of our Client's development, for which a Zoning By-law Amendment has been approved to permit townhouse dwellings, and for which a Site Plan Control application has been endorsed. Lastly, we would appreciate clarification regarding whether it is envisioned that works already undertaken to channelize/restore Mount Joy Creek within the Study Area, such as those previously undertaken across the subject property, are to be eligible for compensation from a future Developers Group?</p> <p>10. Compact Community (Policies 5.1.1-5.1.4) - Is there any contemplation as to how this Section may need to be revised/updated if a second GO Station is created? As the York Region Official Plan (2022) (the 'YROP') identifies Major Mackenzie Drive as a Rapid Transit Corridor terminating at Markham Road, as well as the potential for a new GO Rail Station subject to further study in the vicinity of Major Mackenzie Drive. On this basis, we suggest that</p>	<p>7. See the response to item 1. above regarding the identification and location of public parks. The City is currently undertaking analysis through the Urban Parks Strategy to inform recommendations, and future policy direction, pertaining to stratified parks and POPs. See the response to item 1. above regarding the calculation of parkland in the Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>8. See the response to Item 4. above.</p> <p>9. The Class EA to implement the realignment of Mount Joy Creek as described in Policy 4.3.3 may be undertaken by either the City or the Developers Group. If undertaken by the City, the timing of the project would be subject to funding and priority among other infrastructure projects in Markham. The piped portion of the recommended option to realign Mount Joy Creek is located on the lands south of 9999 Markham Road; the exact location will be determined through the Class EA. Compensation through the Developers Group for restoration works already completed for Mount Joy Creek is a private matter, and should be discussed with landowners and/or developers in the Developers Group when it is formed.</p> <p>10. See the response to item 22. below.</p>
25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>11. Affordable Housing (Policies 5.1.5-5.1.8) - Is it contemplated that if a second GO Station is approved, that inclusionary zoning would be required for that station area as well? We feel the target of 25% of new housing units be affordable, is unrealistic, however acknowledge the goal is laudable. Notwithstanding this, we request clarification as to how the City will implement an Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) framework given the proposed target exceeds the maximum provisions of the Act as proposed to be amended by Bill 23 through a future Ontario Regulation, and also that a portion of the lands within the Secondary Plan (including the subject property) are not within a Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA) or subject to a Community Planning Permit System (CPP). We suggest that consideration should be given to phasing or transitioning towards whatever target is ultimately determined in order to accommodate projects already in the development process, such as with our Client's lands. While attempting to increase the rate at which affordable housing is created, the realities of construction must be considered – specifically that the cost to build an affordable unit is no different than the cost to build a market unit, however these units may need to be sold at a loss to meet the definition of 'affordable' for a specific area. We suggest that incentives be provided to offset the costs of these units to ensure that market rate units are not required to subsidize 'affordable' units, thus resulting in increased costs for all. Such incentives could include the reduction/elimination of planning and permit application fees, development charges, parkland contributions, or community benefits charges, as well as the elimination of the need to provide parking for any 'affordable' units. We are also concerned that the Secondary Plan does not include reference to 'attainable' or 'intrinsically affordable' units.</p>	<p>11. If the GO Station subject to further study at Major Mackenzie Drive East is approved, it would be incorporated as a protected Major Transit Station Area in the Markham Official Plan, to enable inclusionary zoning. The affordable housing targets identified in the draft Secondary Plan are based on the policy direction and targets in the 2022 York Region Official Plan, which the City is required to conform to. The City agrees that additional tools and incentives are needed to facilitate the development of affordable housing. A new policy was added to Section 8.7 Height and Density providing a density exemption for affordable housing units to promote their inclusion within new mixed use or residential buildings. Further to this, affordable housing will be secured by working with York Region, the non-profit sector, and development industry through the applicable legislative framework, agreements, partnerships and available tools. It is also noted that increasing the diversity and supply of housing is necessary to support the development of a complete community and may contribute to 'intrinsic affordability', but is insufficient to meet the needs of low and moderate income households.</p>

25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>12. Multi-Use Trail (Policy 5.2.1 and 6.1.23) - We suggest that where lands are provided to facilitate the creation of the multi-use trail along the rail corridor, which provides an active transportation function that would offset demand from local parks, and consequently a credit should be provided for parkland requirements for a development application.</p> <p>13. Pedestrian Crossings (Policy 6.1.4) - As we have noted in our previous submissions in relation to the Secondary Plan process, Phase 1A of the proposed development (for which Zoning has been approved) is to be of common element condominium tenure. Schedule SP7 to the draft Secondary Plan contemplates a pedestrian crossing of the rail corridor within the Phase 1A lands, indicating that public access would be provided over the pedestrian walkway proposed through our Client's development west of the rail corridor, which extends from the southern property boundary to Major Mackenzie Drive. We request clarification as to whether the City will be taking an access easement over these lands, and further details related to how maintenance of these lands, and potential liability are to be handled in order to minimize potential costs to the future condominium corporation.</p> <p>14. Streets and Blocks (Policy 6.1.8) - We request that further language be included to clarify that with respect to our Client's lands the alignment of any roads and the configuration of any block shown west of the extension of Anderson Avenue and north of Lica Avenue should be considered conceptual only, and are to be further refined and revised through future development applications.</p> <p>15. Streetscapes - While we have no opposition to the provisions of Policies 6.1.12, 13, and 14, we suggest that greater clarity should be provided with respect to what is an 'adequate' soil volume. Further, wider sidewalks, and streetscape elements may potentially preclude the ability to provide said soil volumes, or to provide a sense of enclosure along the street which contributes to a comfortable pedestrian environment.</p> <p>16. Public Art - Should the reference to Section 6.2.7 of the MOP be '6.1.7'? We request confirmation that the provision of Public Art will be considered an 'in kind' contribution for the purposes of the Community Benefits Charge (CBC) By-law or successor.</p>	<p>12. The multi-use trail adjacent to the rail corridor is identified as open space in the draft Secondary Plan. As per Policy 4.3.2.2 c) in the 2014 Official Plan, which states that open space lands are not accepted as parkland dedication, the City does not provide parkland credit for these lands.</p> <p>13. The pedestrian crossing across the railway corridor is intended to provide access to the multi-use trail; the precise location is subject to further study.</p> <p>14. Refer to Policy 7.1.2.4 in the draft Secondary Plan which provides direction for planning local roads within the Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>15. The intent of this policy is to ensure that complete streets, inclusive of street trees which provide social and environmental benefits, are achieved throughout the Secondary Plan Area. Additional design details are not recommended to be added in the draft Secondary Plan as adequate soil volumes to support street trees, including the accommodation of additional streetscaping elements where necessary, are most appropriately confirmed through detailed design at the subdivision/site plan stage.</p> <p>16. The section number has been revised accordingly. Refer to Section 6.1.7 in the 2014 Official Plan and the City's Public Art Policy for more information about the acquisition of public art in Markham. As per the City's Community Benefits Charges By-Law (2022-48), in kind contributions in-lieu of a payment of a portion or all of the required community benefits charges would be subject to Council approval.</p>
25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>17. Built Form - We respectfully suggest that there may be situations wherein it is desirable to have awning, canopies, or signage which encroaches into the ROW to ensure a compact and pedestrian friendly environment. We also suggest that the proposed tower separation of 30-35 metres is too large, and not consistent with the intent to create a compact community. We would suggest that a reduced tower separation of approximately/generally 25-metres can still maintain privacy and sky-views, while mitigating shadow and wind impacts. We suggest that the required separation ought to be based on outcomes and context rather than a specific distance codified in policy.</p> <p>18. Markham Road - We request clarification with respect to who will be undertaking the Class EA for Markham Road described in Policy 7.1.2.3(f)? Is this anticipated to be undertaken by the City, or by a Developers Group?</p> <p>19. Servicing Study (7.2.2) - We request clarification as to how this work would differ from the servicing study already undertaken by the City's consultants as part of the preparation of the Secondary Plan Study?</p> <p>20. Residential Mid- and High-Rise - Please clarify whether the permission for 'stacked' townhouses include back-to-back stacked units? We further question why back-to-back townhouse units would not be permitted in the High-Rise designation, but be allowed in the Mid-Rise designation? We have provided comments related to heights and densities below.</p> <p>21. Public Park (Policies 8.5.1-8.5.3) - Refer to our comments above. Our Client wishes to preserve the right to modify the size and location of the contemplated park west of Anderson Avenue through future development applications, subject to review and acceptance by City Staff. We suggest that a further schedule is required as none of the streets are labelled to correspond with the descriptions in Policy 8.5.3. As noted previously, we request clarification as to how the extent of parkland identified for the Secondary Plan area has been determined.</p>	<p>17. Policy 6.1.29 (formerly 6.1.28) in the draft Secondary Plan was revised to generally identify a setback from the property line of a minimum of 3.0 metres and maximum of 5.0 metres for greater clarity and to ensure that all future developments have frontages that more or less align to create the desired street wall effect. As for the minimum tower separation distance, 30 metres is generally what staff have seen in practice in intensification areas. The minimum separation distance, combined with a maximum tower gross floor plate area of 800 metres square, is meant to avoid overcrowding of the skyline while also mitigating impacts of wind at ground level and shadowing on adjacent properties.</p> <p>18. The Class EA for Markham Road as described in Policy 7.12.3 (f) may be undertaken by either the City or the Developers Group. If undertaken by the City, the timing of the project would be subject to funding and priority among other infrastructure projects in Markham.</p> <p>19. Policy 7.2.2.1 was revised and directs that development applications shall be prepared in accordance with the Municipal Servicing Strategy prepared for the Secondary Plan Area. Policy 7.2.2.2 was revised to clarify that additional servicing studies will be required if the development proposed through an application exceeds the land use provisions in the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>20. The exclusion of townhouses in the 'Residential High Rise' designation was consistent with the approach in the 2014 Official Plan. The draft Secondary Plan was revised to provide for townhouses in the 'Residential High Rise' and 'Mixed Use High Rise' designations if the townhouses are part of a development that integrates one or more apartment buildings.</p> <p>21. See the response to item 1. above regarding the identification and location of public parks, and calculation of parkland in the Secondary Plan Area. Policy 8.5.3 and Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use were revised to ensure the street names correspond to descriptions of the park locations. See item 3. above re how the extent of parkland was identified for the Secondary Plan Area.</p>

25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>22. Policy 9.2 - We support this provision in principle, but suggest that there may be merit in considering additional height irrespective of the decision of Metrolinx to approve a further GO Station. Given the context of the property, and the connectivity to the existing Mount Joy GO Station that would be established upon the completion of the Anderson Avenue extension, as well as the future transit infrastructure envisioned along Major Mackenzie Drive within the YROP (wherein the street is identified as a Rapid Transit Corridor), there is ample opportunity for these lands to contribute positively to the establishment of a compact, transit supportive community. On this basis, we suggest that the Secondary Plan be revised to contemplate additional height and density for the subject property abutting Markham Road and Major Mackenzie Drive, which would serve as a 'secondary node' within the community. Further, there are no details provided as to what potential density would be permitted in the event that additional height is permitted.</p> <p>23. Implementation - Policy 10.2 should clearly identify if any of the Environmental Assessments mentioned within the Secondary Plan are to be undertaken by the Developers Group. We also request confirmation as to whether any planned infrastructure improvements would necessitate the implementation of an Area Specific Development Charge. Finally, for the purposes of Section 10.2 (Developers Group Agreement) and 10.4 (Parkland Dedication and Master Parkland Agreement), we feel these items should be requirements, not simply 'encouraged' by the City.</p> <p>24. Map 3A - We request that the portion of lands west of Anderson Road and east of the future private road currently labelled as 3-storeys be permitted additional height up to 15-storeys. Similarly, the block of land abutting Anderson Road at the southern boundary of the property currently labelled as 6-storeys should be increased. This is consistent with concept plans previously provided to Staff.</p> <p>25. Map 3B - We suggest that the method of illustrating density be revised as the various shades of grey may be difficult to differentiate. Further, we request further details as to how the maximum densities were calculated as in our experience a maximum of 3.5 FSI for a 15-storey building may be too low, and may not permit the optimization of built form.</p>	<p>22. The Subject Lands are located in the North Precinct, which as per the community structure policies is primarily residential in character, and includes community infrastructure and amenities. More specifically, the Subject Lands are situated between Markham Road and the Stouffville GO Railway Corridor immediately south of Major Mackenzie Drive East and were originally identified as 'Residential Neighbourhood Area' in the draft Secondary Plan to implement the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. The draft Secondary Plan was revised to allow for a mix of uses and greater heights on a portion of the Subject Lands at the intersection of Major Mackenzie Drive East and Markham Road while still keeping with the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. See Map SP1 - Community Structure, Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use, and Map SP3 - Height for the revisions to the permitted uses and heights. The lands now designated 'Mixed Use High Rise' are still subject to an area and site specific policy; the area and site specific policy was also revised to clarify the density that would be permitted if the GO Station Subject to Further Study at Major Mackenzie Drive East is approved, among other things.</p> <p>23. The Environmental Assessments identified in the draft Secondary Plan may be undertaken by either the City or the Developers Group. If undertaken by the City, the timing of the project would be subject to funding and priority among other infrastructure projects in Markham. The need for an Area Specific Development Charge is being explored and subject to further discussion. In terms of cost sharing agreements, landowners and developers have been encouraged since the outset of the Study in 2019 to form a Developers Group to support an equitable distribution of costs for community infrastructure and services. Given that the City would not be involved in the Developer's Group, the City can only encourage the formation of a group or agreement between developers.</p> <p>24. See response to item 22. above.</p> <p>25. See Appendix 2 - Density (formerly Map SP3B - Density), which has been revised to use different colours to distinguish FSIs. Refer to the Final Study Report, Section 6.4.5, for a discussion of how density was determined.</p>
25	6-Oct-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road Cont'd	<p>26. Finally, we note that the Servicing Study prepared by the City's consultant as part of the background study process has not yet been released for review and comment. We would appreciate the opportunity to have this document in advance of any final consideration of the Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>26. Noted - A draft of the Final Municipal Servicing Study was published on the project webpage on October 23, 2023.</p>
26	1-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Email	Joanne Barnett c/o Markham Subaru 9401 Markham Road	<p>1. Expressed support for the 'Mixed Use High Rise' designation identified on the Subject Lands in the draft Secondary Plan, but maintain that the range of heights in this precinct (i.e., 20 to 35 storeys) should not be transitioned throughout the block as there is sufficient transit infrastructure, both existing and proposed to support consistent heights.</p> <p>2. Commented that the appeal for 37 and 42 storeys on the adjacent property to the south is being monitored.</p> <p>3. Commented that Markham Subaru is interested in remaining at the location with a more sophisticated mixed use development.</p>	<p>1. The Subject Lands are located in the Central Precinct along Markham Road, which as per the community structure policies, is intended to accommodate the secondary peak in height and density. The Subject Lands are also situated within the Mount Joy GO Station MTSA, but outside the Mount Joy GO Mixed Use Node which is intended as the primary peak in height and density. The 'Mixed Use High Rise' land use designation, maximum height of 20 storeys and density of 7.0 FSI identified for the Subject Lands, are based on the community structure established to guide the pattern of development, particularly peaks and transitions in height and density, in the Secondary Plan Area. The Draft Secondary Plan provides flexibility with regard to height within the Mount Joy GO MTSA subject to criteria relating to transportation, servicing, urban design and the provision of affordable housing as per Policy 8.7.3.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p>
27	14-Nov-23	Prescribed Body	Email	N. Lingard c/o Bell Canada	<p>1. Submitted comments in response to the notification of the November 21 public meeting. Comments indicated that Bell Canada does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time, and requested to be circulated on any future materials and/or decisions related to this matter.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>
28	14-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Brutto Consulting c/o The Monopoly Group 158 Anderson Avenue	<p>1. Expressed concern that a portion of the Subject Lands are being redesignated from 'Mixed Use High Rise' to 'Residential Mid Rise, particularly given it's location within the Mount Joy GO Station MTSA.</p> <p>2. Requested that the draft secondary plan be revised to provide for a maximum height of 36 storeys on the Subject Lands.</p> <p>3. Referred to detailed comments in the Planning Justification Report for a conceptual development comprising two 36-storey towers on the Subject Lands.</p>	<p>1. to 3. See response to Submission 4 above.</p>

29	16-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	KLM Planning Partners Inc. c/o 9781 Markham Road	<p>Submitted the following comments in advance of the November 21 public meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Map SP3A - Height - Development of the Subject Lands is controlled by the in force site-specific Community Amenity One Exception 425 (CA1*425) zone standards approved under By-law 2023-58, where a maximum building height of thirty-three (33) storeys is permitted. However, Map SP3A – Height in the draft policy framework for the MRMJSP proposes a maximum building height of twenty-five (25) storeys on the western portion of the Subject Lands. It is our opinion that the policy framework and associated schedules in the MRMJSP should reflect the site-specific provisions for the Subject Lands, recently approved by Council in March 2023, in order to ensure conformity between the Zoning Bylaw and Secondary Plan, as required in the Planning Act. As such, we request that Map SP3A – Height is revised to be consistent with the site-specific zoning and the maximum building height on the portion of the Subject Lands designated “Mixed Use High Rise” is revised to thirty-three (33) storeys accordingly. Parkland Policies - Policy 8.1.7 identifies publicly owned parkland as a use which is permitted in all designations. Although Map SP2 - Detailed Land Use does not designate the proposed 0.17-hectare stratified park on the Subject Lands as “Public Park”, we recommend that Policy 8.1.7 and Section 8.5 of the Secondary Plan be revised to acknowledge the role that stratified parks (“strata parks”) can play in providing a full range of public parkland and open space across the entirety of the Secondary Plan Area. The Secondary Plan should contain policies that support the potential implementation of strata parks, where appropriate, to assist Owners and the City in building complete communities that are well attuned to the unique characteristics of high-density development. Built Form Policies - Policies 6.1.31, 6.1.32, and 6.1.33 provide built form policies pertaining to minimum setbacks, maximum tower floor plate, and minimum tower separation that are typically found in Urban Design Guidelines or Zoning By-laws. Including these provisions within the Secondary Plan leaves no flexibility to accommodate slight deviations to these requirements without the need for an amendment to the Official Plan. As such, in order to allow for an appropriate degree of flexibility, we recommend that the built form policies noted above be revised to indicate that the requirements “should” or “shall generally” be met. Without this revision, slight deviations to these requirements will require an Official Plan Amendment, creating an additional, onerous layer to the planning application process. It should be acknowledged that the City can maintain the ability to review and approve such deviances through a more appropriate avenue such as Zoning By-law Amendments and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Map SP3 - Height was revised to reflect the maximum height of 33 storeys in the ZBLA applicable to the Phase 2 development on the northern portion of the Subject Lands that was approved by Council in March 2023. The City is currently undertaking analysis through the Urban Parks Strategy to inform recommendations, and future policy direction, for stratified parks and privately owned public spaces. The built form policies relating to minimum setbacks, maximum tower floor plate sizes, and minimum tower separation distances include metrics based on what has been incorporated into the design of recently approved intensification projects. The policies work together to avoid overcrowding of the skyline while also mitigating the impacts of wind at ground level and shadow impacts on adjacent properties. Minor revisions were made to the policies to provide flexibility with respect to their implementation.
30	18-Nov-23	Resident	Email	D. Burd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Questioned whether the high density development anticipated in the Secondary Plan Area will worsen traffic through Markham Village. Comments also noted changes to traffic circulation patterns that funnel northbound Markham Road traffic to Main Street as well as limited alternate road options to access Highway 407 and Highway 401 from Markham Road. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the Final Transportation Report for a discussion of the key findings of the transportation analysis that was completed based on the anticipated development in the Secondary Plan Area.
31	20-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	Humphries Planning Group Inc. c/o Krashnik Investments Limited 9833 & 9829 Markham Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Firstly, we have a concern in the utilization in the plan and reports of the words “recommend” and “encourage” regarding matters related to formation of cost sharing agreements for parkland, school sites and other matters typically addressed through agreements entered into by landowner cost sharing groups as a precondition to development. It appears that there is no requirement for such to be undertaken as part of a development approval process and therefore no guarantee that a landowner who is potentially saddled with a greater number of public/institutional uses will derive appropriate compensation for such. The proposed land use designations and implementing land use policy for the Subject Lands are not adequate. Greater building heights should be applicable given the location of the lands and surrounding context. Further to such, we continue to remain opposed to the proposed open channel portion of the Mount Joy Creek through the Subject Lands and statements made by staff that lands with 30m of the railway corridor cannot be utilized for development purposes. As previously indicated, we do not support an open channel anywhere on the subject lands. The Mount Joy Creek should remain closed and routed beneath the future Anderson Avenue for economic and development efficiency purposes. Further, we are concerned that the proposed policy not only does not implement the City’s intention for school sites but does not provide appropriate height and density. We understand and note that the Final Study Report September 2023 encourages mixed use development and higher building heights on school sites, a recommendation with which we agree, but this encouragement is not reflected in the planning document. Without the appropriate land use policy in place for school site matters regarding height and density along with definite assurances for cost sharing we are opposed to such designation on the subject property. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> See response to Submission 2, item 3 above. See response to Submission 2, item 1 above regarding land use designations and maximum building heights. A portion of the Subject Lands is within the Mount Joy Creek floodplain as shown on Map SP5 - Natural Heritage Features. The Secondary Plan Study included the evaluation of five (5) options to reconfigure Mount Joy Creek to address flood hazards and enhance the Greenway System in the northern portion of the Secondary Plan Area. A hybrid option comprising a piped and open channel system adjacent to the railway corridor performed the best in the evaluation and was therefore included in the draft Secondary Plan. As per Policy 4.3.3., future work through a comprehensive study such as a municipal class environmental assessment or equivalent is needed to implement the realignment and possibly daylight a portion of Mount Joy Creek to remove the flood hazard on certain lands in the Secondary Plan Area.. See response to Submission 2, item 4 above.

32	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Letter	KLM Planning Partners Inc. c/o Wismer Markham (Commercial) Developments Inc. (Metrus Properties)	<p>1. Expressed concerns about the concentration of community infrastructure and services on the Subject Lands, and suggested that the public parks should be distributed throughout the Secondary Plan Area to provide better access to all residents, and that the elementary school block would be better suited directly adjacent to the Mount Joy GO Station.</p> <p>2. Requested that policies within the draft Secondary Plan require the creation of a landowner's group prior to development applications being approved to ensure those that have community uses on their lands are appropriately and fairly compensated.</p>	<p>1. The Subject Lands are located in the North and Central Precincts, between Markham Road and the western boundary of the Secondary Plan Area, and designated 'Mixed Use High Rise', 'Residential High Rise', 'Residential Mid Rise', 'Public Park' and 'Institutional' to implement the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. The public park, and public school site identified on the Subject Lands are also based on the recommendations of the Secondary Plan Study, which comprehensively analyzed land use and urban design, transportation and municipal servicing to determine what infrastructure and amenities would be needed to support growth in the Secondary Plan Area. As per policy 10.2.1, the new schools and public parks were incorporated in the Draft Secondary Plan without regard to ownership in the Secondary Plan Area.</p> <p>2. Landowners and developers have been encouraged since the outset of the Study in 2019 to form a Developers Group to support an equitable distribution of costs for community infrastructure and services. Given that the City would not be involved in the Developer's Group, the City can only encourage the formation of a group or agreement between developers.</p>
33	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Kagan Shastri LLP c/o Trinity Point Developments (Four Towers) 9331 to 9399 Markham Road	<p>1. Noted that the Subject Lands are approximately 400 metres south of the Mount Joy GO Station, and 40 metres from the southern edge of the extended station platform, and that a revised zoning bylaw amendment (ZBLA) application for a mixed use building with a 37-storey tower and a 42-storey tower connected by a 3-storey skey bridge was submitted.</p> <p>2. Noted that comments have been submitted throughout the secondary plan planning process outlining concerns about the height and density restrictions on the Subject Lands which contradict the intent to ensure that intensification and density is focused around the Mount Joy GO Station. Further, the height and density restrictions on the Subject Lands are significantly less than the heights and densities approved on other sites in the Secondary Plan Area that do not enjoy the immediate relationship to Mount Joy GO Station that the Subject Lands do. The restrictions are even less supportable given that the Subject Lands are located at gateway location.</p> <p>3. Acknowledged that the draft Secondary Plan provides a mechanism for increased heights and densities without an amendment, but expressed concern that the incremental increases will not be sufficient to address the heights proposed in the ZBLA application or the objectives of the draft Secondary Plan.</p> <p>4. Commented that a more appropriate approach would be to remove the height and density limits on the lands surrounding the Mount Joy GO Station including the Subject Lands.</p> <p>5. Expressed concern with the place of worship designated north of the Subject Lands, which has a maximum height of 2-storeys., and commented at the location of the place of worship should not be a consideration as to what height should be appropriate on other lands near or adjacent to the Mount Joy GO Station.</p> <p>6. Expressed concern that the draft secondary plan policies that provide direction to align development with the provision of servicing and other community infrastructure will delay the delivery of much needed housing. There is a need for policy language to support the advancement of projects, such as the development proposed on the Subject Lands, that are ready to be advanced and will contribute to needed infrastructure such as public roads based on servcing that has been generally allocated to the City.</p>	<p>Note: The Development Application for the Subject Lands was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (Case Number OLT-23-00747).</p>
34	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	K. Usman c/o Islamic Centre of Markham 1330 Castlemore Avenue	<p>1. Noted that the Islamic Centre of Markham was originally planning to build a mosque at a location on 16th Avenue and Williamson Road, but due to opposition from some community members and councillors the mosque was voluntarilly moved to its current location.</p> <p>2. Commented that the open channel concept for Mount Joy Creek shown on the mosque lands is not supported by the Islamic Centre of Markham, and that there are three other options that are cheaper and acceptable to other affected landowners.</p> <p>3. Expressed concern that the open channel concept and the potential expropriation of the land to implement the open channel concept would remove land needed for parking for the mosque's current operations.</p> <p>4. Commented that the mosque does not support the multi-use trail proposed adjacent to the open channel on their lands, and requested that it be moved to the other side of the railway corridor.</p> <p>5. Requested assistance to build a school on the mosque property which cannot be approved by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority until a flood hazard on the lands is removed, and suggested piping Mount Joy Creek under Anderson Avenue.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2., 3. and 5. see responses to Submission 5 above.</p> <p>4. A multi-use trail is proposed adjacent to the west side of the railway corridor from Major Mackenzie Road East in the north to 16th Avenue in the south to increase opportunities for a convenient and continuous active transportation network within the Secondary Plan Area, and support walking and cycling. A similar multi-use trail already exists on the east side of the railway corridor.</p>
35	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	S. Malik c/o Islamic Centre of Markham 1330 Castlemore Avenue	<p>1. Commented that the Islamic Centre of Markham is not supportive of the open channel for Mount Joy Creek on the east portion of the mosque's lands.</p>	<p>1. See responses to Submission 5 above.</p>
36	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Brutto Consulting c/o The Monopoly Group 158 Anderson Avenue	<p>1. Commented that the draft Secondary Plan is headed in the right direction in terms of land uses, including on the Subject Lands.</p> <p>2. Commented that there is a disconnect between the identified maximum height of 20 storeys and density of 7.0 FSI on the Subject Lands despite being within walking distance of the Mount Joy GO Station, and the future Major Mackenzie GO Station. Surrounding properties have maximum height of 25 storeys.</p> <p>3. Expressed an interest to continue working with staff and other landowners, and noted that written comments were also submitted in advance of the public meeting.</p>	<p>1. to 3. See response to Submission 4 above.</p>

37	21-Nov-23	Resident	Deputation	E. Brown c/o Sherwood Rate Payer's Association	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concern about the number of high density buildings anticipated in the Secondary Plan Area, their location in relation to the street, and the impact of the heights and densities on the Markham Road corridor. 2. Expressed concern about the traffic that will result from anticipated development, and inquired whether there will be sufficient transit. 3. Expressed concern about permitting residential uses above grade in the employment lands, and inquired what is planned for the employment lands. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. and 2. Lands within the Secondary Plan Area centred around the Mount Joy GO Station area are delineated as an <i>intensification area</i> in the 2014 Official Plan, and planned to accommodate growth at higher densities. The draft Secondary Plan establishes a comprehensive policy framework to support the long-term development of a vibrant mixed use, transit oriented and complete community. Higher density development is anticipated to take place over the long term and will be phased based on the availability of transportation and municipal servicing infrastructure and services. Subsequent work in the planning process will focus on creating an inviting, attractive and inclusive community through urban design. 3. The existing employment lands in the Secondary Plan Area located north of Mount Joy GO Station are being retained under the designation 'Mixed Use Mid Rise - Employment Priority'. The intent of the designation is to broaden the employment uses historically permitted on the lands while introducing compatible and complementary non-employment uses to promote transit supportive development near Mount Joy GO Station. Residential uses will be discretionary on these lands.
38	21-Nov-23	Resident	Deputation	H. Poon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requested maintaining the 'Mixed Use' designation on lands along Markham Road north of Castlemore Avenue to encourage walking to grocery stores, coffee shops, etc. 2. Emphasized the need to improve local transit service in the Secondary Plan Area before development actually comes to support transit use; the current level of service is unacceptable. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A portion of the lands fronting Markham Road and Major Mackenzie Drive East were redesignated from 'Residential High Rise' to 'Mixed Use High Rise' in the draft Secondary Plan. See the response to Submission 25, item 22. above. 2. The draft Secondary Plan provides direction to work with York Region and Metrolinx to enhance transit services in the Secondary Plan Area. Refer to Policy 7.1.3.1 in the draft Secondary Plan and the Final Transportation Report for more information about this matter.
39	21-Nov-23	Resident	Deputation	C. Roggue	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expressed concern about the impact of high density development in the Secondary Plan Area on traffic, as well as access to Highway 407, given constraints on roads (e.g., potential to widen Main Street, Markham Road, Ninth Line, McCowan Road) in the surrounding communities. Inquired if anyone has thought about the traffic impacts of the plan. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road widening is planned to increase the capacity of Regional roads in Markham (i.e., McCowan Road, 16th Avenue, Kennedy Road, Elgin Mills Road East), and work is underway to accelerate design and construction. However, investments in rapid transit and aligning growth with transit in mixed use communities is also needed to shift the reliance on automobile use to transit use and active transportation. Service enhancements are planned on the Stouffville GO Railway Corridor, specifically, two-way all-day service between Union Station and Mount Joy Station by 2041, and an additional GO Rail Station Subject to Further Study is also identified at Major Mackenzie Drive East. Bus rapid transit (BRT) service is also planned on Major Mackenzie Drive East by 2051 to accommodate future growth and provide connections to transit and destinations in west Markham. In addition, the Secondary Plan Study included a comprehensive transportation analysis to determine the infrastructure and service requirements to the street network, intersections controls, lane configurations, and transit services needed to accommodate the growth anticipated in the Secondary Plan Area. The mode share assumptions used in the analysis, and the results of the analysis are detailed in the Final Transportation Report. The results of the analysis informed the preparation of the draft Secondary Plan.
40	21-Nov-23	Landowner / Developer	Deputation	Evans Planning c/o 2585231 Ontario Inc. 9999 Markham Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted that detailed written comments were provided to staff prior to the public meeting. 2. Requested that the City assist with the formation of a landowners group for the Secondary Plan Area. 3. Noted that the Subject Lands about the future GO Station at Major Mackenzie Drive East, and that the landowners would be interested as part of a group of landowners who would benefit from the future GO Station here or at Dension Street in front ending the cost of preparing the business case as previously conveyed to staff, with benefits to the heights and densities on the northern portion of the Subject Lands. 4. Expressed concern about the revision to the land use designation from mixed use to residential on the Subject Lands. 5. Commented that consideration should be given to moving toward a built form framework with only minimum heights and densities, and using urban design considerations (e.g., setbacks, angular planes and shadows) to determine the appropriate height, density and built form that can be supported by traffic and servicing studies rather than setting the maximums in the Secondary Plan. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. and 2. See responses to Submission 25 above. 3. Noted. 4. See response to Submission 25 above. 5. Maximum heights and densities are identified in the draft Secondary Plan to support the implementation of the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. The provision of maximum heights and densities also conforms to the 2022 YROP which requires that local municipalities establish minimum and maximum heights and densities in secondary plans in strategic growth areas such as the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Area. It is also noted that the draft Secondary Plan takes a permissive approach to density, and that Map SP3B - Density is now Appendix 2 - Density.
41	4-Dec-23	Resident	Email	E. Tan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submitted comments regarding the Cadillac Fairview development proposal for Markville Mall that referenced the draft Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan. The comments noted that the projected population and jobs in the MRMJ Secondary Plan Area are challenging to the surrounding communities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted.

42	22-Dec-23	Landowner / Developer	Email	R. Mangotich c/o Fieldgate Developments 10015 Highway 48	<p>1. I'm writing on behalf of Light Blue Developments Limited (Light Blue) and Midnight Blue Developments Limited (Midnight), owners of lands immediately to the north of Major Mackenzie Drive on either side of Markham Road respectively. Despite never having received any direct notice whatsoever from the City of Markham, our attention has been drawn to the draft Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan which includes a depiction of its study area extending onto these two parcels. Further, the Plan appears to suggest a "GO Rail Station subject to further study" on the lands belonging to Light Blue. It is remarkable that neither the City nor its consultants engaged the owners of lands so significantly impacted.</p> <p>2. Of particular offence, is the background Transportation Report, prepared by HDR dated June and marked final, which appears to have included detailed research, again without ever having involved or advised a significantly impacted landowner. This report depicts a substantial automobile parking lot located directly on Light's lands. Once again, it is astounding that such an impactful land use change would be suggested on private lands without formally inviting the affected landowner to engage in the process, and comment and voice concerns or otherwise.</p> <p>3. We would ask, please, that all of the text and graphics associated with the Plan be revised to add the word "Potential" before "GO Rail Station subject to further study", and that text be added to make it abundantly clear that the location of the "Potential GO Rail Station subject to further study" has not been determined. Further, we ask that all Plan graphics and schedules be revised to relocate the depiction of the "Potential GO Rail Station subject to further study" to the east side of the existing railway line and north of the future alignment of Major Mackenzie Drive. We believe that the area of land lying amidst the realigned Major Mackenzie Drive, the extended Donald Cousins Parkway, and the existing railway line provides ample space for a station and parking, and with far greater accessibility.</p>	<p>1. The Subject Lands are located north of Major Mackenzie Drive East, and are currently outside the City's urban boundary. There are no policies or land use designations proposed in the draft Secondary Plan that would apply to these lands. City staff met with representatives of the Upper Markham Village ("UMV") landowner's group, which includes the Subject Lands, during the Secondary Plan Study to provide updates about the Study and learn more about the long-term plans for the UMV lands.</p> <p>2. The lands north of Major Mackenzie Drive East were included in the Secondary Plan Study Area to assess the feasibility of an additional GO Rail Station on the Stouffville GO Rail Corridor at Major Mackenzie Drive East. A 'GO Rail Station Subject to Further Study' in this general location is identified in the 2022 YROP and 2022 York Region Transportation Master Plan ("YRTMP"). The location of the GO Rail Station Subject to Further Study has not been determined, and the centroid shown on Map SP1 – Community Structure and Map SP7 – Transit and Active Transportation Network in the draft Secondary Plan is conceptual. As a next step the feasibility assessment recommends engaging Metrolinx through its Initial Business Case (IBC) process to advance the discussion on the feasibility of a GO Station.</p> <p>3. The term "GO Rail Station Subject to Further Study" is from with the language used in the 2022 YROP and 2022 YRTMP and should remain consistent with these plans. The feasibility review undertaken through the Secondary Plan Study recommended protecting for a station in this general location, in part because of environmental considerations on the lands north east of the railway corridor that are within the provincial Greenbelt Plan. The centroid shown on Schedule A - Amendment to Map 1 - Markham Structure was deleted and will be reviewed through the City's Official Plan Review. The centroid of the station location shown on Map SP1 – Community Structure and Map SP7 – Transit and Active Transportation Network in the draft Secondary Plan is conceptual, and has been moved to the intersection of the Stouffville GO Rail Corridor and Major Mackenzie Drive East for clarity.</p>
42	22-Dec-23	Landowner / Developer	Email	R. Mangotich c/o Fieldgate Developments 10015 Highway 48	<p>4. We also note that the background servicing report seems to have failed to recognize previously planned sanitary flows from north of Major Mackenzie. The original system design indicates a sanitary catchment area to the north, but the report supporting this Plan appears to ignore this completely. We see this as a shortcoming of the study and request that a proper analysis be completed that thoroughly investigates and provides for the servicing of this area.</p>	<p>4. In terms of municipal servicing, as work proceeds to bring the lands north of Major Mackenzie Drive East into the City's urban boundary in conformity with the 2022 YROP, the City will require all lands within the drainage area to connect to the York Durham Sewage System ("YDSS"), through the Markham Road Trunk Sewer catchment area, to be analyzed in full. This could include some areas of both the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Area and UMV lands.</p>
Note: The following correspondence was submitted prior to the release of the draft Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan in June 2023, and is included here to document a revision applicable to the Subject Lands.						
	10-Aug-22	Landowner / Developer	Email	Malone Given Parsons c/o Legatus Advisory Services 9311 Markham Road	<p>1. Commented that the maximum height for the Subject Lands was increased from 11 storeys in the draft demonstration plan to 15 storeys in the revised demonstration plan, partially addressing previous comments from January 2022 and providing greater flexibility for redevelopment on the Subject Lands. Requested that the maximum height be further increased from 15 storeys to 20+ storeys and the land use type be revised from Mixed Use Mid Rise to Mixed Use High Rise to provide flexibility for a redevelopment that can integrate a grocery store.</p>	<p>1. The Subject Lands are located in the South Precinct, which as per the community structure policies in the draft Secondary Plan is characterized by retail uses and intended to serve residents and visitors. More specifically, the Subject Lands are situated south of Edward Jeffreys Avenue between Markham Road and the Stouffville GO Railway Corridor and designated 'Mixed Use High Rise' to implement the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. The maximum height on the Subject Lands shown on Map SP3A - Height (now Map SP3 - Height) was increased from 15 storeys to 20 storeys to facilitate retaining the existing grocery store use if the lands are redeveloped and still aligns with the community structure established for the Secondary Plan Area. There were no revisions to the density identified for the Subject Lands, however Policy 8.7.2 provides consideration for densities exceeding the FSIs shown on Appendix 2 - Density (formerly Map SP3B - Density) subject to meeting criteria relating to transportation, servicing, urban design and the provision of affordable housing and/or rental housing. Similarly, Policy 8.7.3 provides consideration for additional heights up to 5 storeys above the maximum height shown on Map SP3 - Height on lands designated 'Mixed Use High Rise' within the Mount Joy GO MTSAs subject to meeting the same criteria noted in Policy 8.7.2.</p>