

From: Don Payne
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2024 6:18 PM
To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>
Cc: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>
Subject: Traffic in Markham particularly on Highway 7 and elsewhere

CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I've been living in Markham for 52 years and during that time I've seen the amount of traffic build. This is to be expected when you consider how the City has grown over the years. However, while more housing is needed in Ontario, there needs to be greater consideration as to how high rise condos packed into an area along Highway 7 (and elsewhere in Markham) very greatly make traffic congestion unbearable and make living in Markham unbearable. Its not just the number of vehicles themselves but all the exhaust they generate which residents have to inhale. Certainly the more people who live and shop in Markham is good for business, but being good for business is not necessarily what is good for the people in Markham.

Don Payne
=====

From: John Clark
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 1:03 PM
To: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>
Subject: Mount Joy Secondary Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a resident of Main Street North, I believe this plan will cause more problems than it solves. Putting that many people in such a small area is going to change that area and the surrounding areas for many years to come.

The assumption that public transit will be used, in place of the private car, is misplaced. The increased traffic on all adjacent roads cannot be underestimated. The current impact, on residential roads by cars, is a serious issue.

Without upgrades to 16th Avenue and Major Mackenzie, the east-west traffic volume be difficult as will be the north-south traffic trying to get to the 407 via Main Street, 9th Line or McCowen.

The residential areas to the south, east and west of the Mount Joy Plan will be seriously impacted

Although public transit might be convenient for the increased population on Markham Road, communities surrounding this area have not been designed for public transit.

The traffic on the roads that currently service this area is congested, especially in Old Markham, while exceeding the posted speed limit occurs frequently. I believe both of the aforementioned issues will increase.

Regards

John Clark
362 Main Street North
Markham, On
L3P1Z1

From: tenny silva
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 8:29 PM
To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>
Cc: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>
Subject: Concerns on the Markham Road and Mount Joy Secondary Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

As a resident of Markham for the past four years, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Markham Road-Mount Joy Secondary Plan.

Foremost among my concerns is the anticipated impact on traffic within the area. The proposed influx of 33,000 residents will inevitably lead to increased congestion on our roads. Many of these new residents will likely rely on the Mount Joy GO station for commuting purposes, exacerbating the already limited availability of parking spaces. Furthermore, the current frequency of train services on the GO line may not adequately accommodate the surge in ridership, potentially resulting in overcrowding and further aggravating transportation woes. As someone who cherishes the tranquility of Markham, I fear that such developments could compromise the quality of life in our city.

Moreover, the proposed expansion could place undue strain on our healthcare infrastructure. With only one hospital serving the community, the influx of new residents may overwhelm our healthcare system, leading to longer wait times and diminished access to essential services.

I implore you to heed the voices of Markham residents in this matter and carefully consider the long-term implications of the Markham Road-Mount Joy Secondary Plan. It is imperative that we prioritize sustainable growth and preserve the unique character of our city for future generations.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Thank you,
Tenny Silva
52 Eastern Skies Way,
Markham, ON, L6E0N8



KLM File: P-3367

64 JARDIN DRIVE, UNIT 1B
CONCORD, ONTARIO L4K 3P3

T 905.669.4055
KLMPANNING.COM

April 17, 2024

City of Markham
Development Services Committee
101 Town Centre Boulevard
Markham, Ontario
L3R 9W3

**Attention: Kimberley Kitteringham
City Clerk**

**Re: Development Services Committee
April 23, 2024 - Item 9.1 Recommendation Report City Initiated Official Plan
Amendment For The Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan,
File No. PR 20 142832 (Wards 4, 5 And 6) (10.3)
9408 - 9426 Markham Road
City Of Markham, Region Of York**

Dear Ms. Kitteringham,

KLM Planning Partners Inc. is the land use planning consultant representing the owner of the lands located at 9408 - 9426 Markham Road in the City of Markham. On behalf of our client, we would like to submit our comments on the Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan.

The Subject Lands are located immediately at the southwest corner of the intersection of Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenue. The site has an area of approximately +/- 0.78 hectares (1.93 acres) with a frontage of +/- 71 metres along Edward Jeffreys Avenue and +/- 118 metres along Markham Road. The lands are generally flat with no significant environmental features and are occupied by a commercial plaza.

The Subject Lands are approximately 260 metres south the Mount Joy GO Transit Station, directly north of Pottery Park, approximately 60 metres north of the Markham Museum and approximately 300 metres north of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

York Region Official Plan (2022)

The Subject Lands are designated as 'Urban Area' and 'Community Area' by York Region Official Plan (2022) *Map 1 – Regional Structure and Map 1A – Land Use Designations* respectively. The 'Urban Area' and 'Community Area' designations are identified as locations for growth and development in the Region within the Urban System and permits a mix of uses. The Subject Lands are located within a 'Major Transit Station Area' specifically *PMTSA 18 – Mount Joy GO Station* which has a minimum density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare.

City of Markham Official Plan (2014)

The City of Markham Official Plan designates the Subject Lands as 'Mixed Use Neighbourhood Area' and 'Mixed Use Mid Rise' by *Map 1 – Markham Structure and Map 3 – Land Use* respectively. The 'Mixed Use Mid Rise' land use designation permits a mix of residential, retail, restaurant and service uses that contribute to the creation of complete communities while improving access to transit services. The

Official Plan further notes that the Subject lands are within the unapproved 'Markham Road Corridor – Mount Joy' Secondary Plan on *Appendix F – Secondary Plan Areas*.

Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan

The Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study was initiated in November 2019 in preparation of the new secondary plan. We have reviewed the Mount Joy Secondary Plan (the 'MRMJ') as drafted and released for public consultation prior to finalization and approval.

In keeping with the Official Plan designation, the Subject Lands are designated as 'Mixed Use Neighbourhood Area' by *Map SP1 Community Structure* which also identifies the intersection of Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenue as a 'Gateway Landmark'. The Subject Lands are designated 'Mixed Use Mid Rise – Retail Priority' by *Map SP2 – Detailed Land Use* of the MRMJ which intends to maintain and expand the existing retail and service uses while integrating residential uses and providing a downward transition in height toward the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The Secondary Plan identifies permitted height and density on *Map SP3A – Height* and *Map SP3B Density* which identify a maximum permitted height of 8 storeys and density of 3.0 FSI for the Subject Lands and identifies the existing Pottery Park to the south as well as new Public Park on the lands opposite Markham Road. Markham Road is identified as a 'Major Collector Road' and Edward Jeffreys Avenue as a 'Minor Collector Road' on *Map SP6 Transportation Network*. Separated cycling facilities for both Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenue are identified on *Map SP7 Transit and Active Transportation Network* in addition to Markham Road being identified as a 'Frequent Transit Network Route'.

Surrounding Development Applications

We have reviewed development proposals within the MRMJ to understand whether the contemplated height and density are in keeping with current redevelopment aspirations. A summary of these applications is provided in the table below with approximate statistics.

| No. | Address | Secondary Plan Designation | Height | | Density | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|-------------|----------|
| | | | Permitted | Proposed | Permitted | Proposed |
| 1. | 9331, 9351 and 9399 Markham Road | Mixed Use Neighbourhood Area | 20-25 storeys | 37 and 42 storeys | 7.0 FSI | 6.6 FSI |
| 2. | 77 Anderson Avenue | Mixed Use Employment Priority | 30 storeys | 45 storeys | 7.0 FSI | 8.6 FSI |
| 3. | 9781 Markham Road | Mixed Use Neighbourhood Area | 25 storeys | 32 and 27 storeys | 7.0 FSI | 5.2 FSI |
| 4. | 9900 Markham Road | Residential Neighbourhood Area and Greenway | 15-20 storeys | 21 storeys | 3.0-7.0 FSI | 3.32 FSI |

The development applications submitted to the City within the MRMJ generally propose high-rise buildings ranging in heights from twenty-one (21) to forty-five (45) storeys with FSI that ranges from 3.3

to 8.6. Of particular relevance is the development application at 9331, 9351 and 9399 Markham Road which is located opposite of Markham Road to the east of the Subject Lands.

Generally speaking, the contemplated height and density permissions of the MRMJ are being exceeded by proposed development applications.

Land Use Comments and Requested Modifications

With respect to the identification of a 'Landmark Gateway' at the Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenue, the MRMJ indicates that these areas are intended to make a significant contribution to the character and identity of the Secondary Plan while respecting immediate context and creating a district-built form, appearance or landmark feature. We feel this objective is best achieved by implementing relatively taller buildings and higher densities such that the built form is prominent and economies of scale can allow for higher quality built form and a significant architectural contribution. Providing for additional building height may also allow for more meaningful space to be provided at grade with more generous building setbacks and an opportunity to respond to the landmark designation at a pedestrian scale.

With respect to the 'Mixed Use Mid Rise – Retail Priority' designation and the desire to provide a downward transition in height toward the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District (the "Heritage District"), we reiterate that the Heritage District is approximately 300 metres away from the Subject Lands. Allowing a height of greater than 8 stories and a density of greater than 3 FSI is unlikely to have any material impact on the Heritage District. In addition, Pottery Park occupies 60 metres of frontage along Markham Road south of the Subject Lands and provides for a physical separation from the Markham Museum to the south and Heritage District beyond. In this regard, there is significant physical separation between the Subject Lands and the Heritage District. In addition, the Subject Lands, having more than 118 metres of frontage along Markham Road, allow for a meaningful opportunity to provide transition within the Subject Lands through the arrangement of heights and built form on future development applications. Lastly, given that Pottery Park and the Markham Museum are south of the Subject Lands, it is unlikely that redevelopment of the Subject Lands would result in any meaningful shadow impact on these lands.

With respect to the 'Mixed Use Mid Rise – Retail Priority' designation and the desire to maintain and expand existing retail and service uses to meet the needs of residents while integrating residential uses, we believe that viable and vibrant retail uses benefit from higher residential densities. In this regard, we do not believe it is appropriate to require that retail uses be maintained or expanded while limiting the residential uses that can benefit from convenient access to retail and service uses to meet daily needs.

With respect to both Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenues being identified as collector roads with planned separated bicycling facilities, the Subject Lands will be at the immediate intersection of two cycling routes within the MRMJ. Furthermore, the MRMJ contemplates a new minor collector road connection, with separated bicycling facilities, from Markham Road and Edward Jeffreys Avenue directly to the GO Transit Station. In this regard, the Subject Lands will benefit from improvements to the transportation network and the redevelopment of the Subject Lands should consider this investment in infrastructure as well as investments to the GO Transit Station and rapid transit corridor.

With respect to the maximum permitted height of 8 storeys and FSI of 3.0, we do not believe that this is appropriate in the context of the goals and objectives of the Secondary Plan or in the physical context of the Subject Lands as is substantiated through proposed applications for redevelopment in the Secondary Plan area.

The Subject Lands are within a roughly 3 minute walk to a Major Transit Station with a future separated bicycle facility enabling a roughly 1 minute commute to the station by bicycle. The Subject Lands are bound by open space to the west and south with future parkland to the east and high rise development to the north. It is not practical or appropriate to limit height and density for lands with physical separation from low rise uses and proximity to parkland and existing high density development.

We believe that the expanded retail uses sought through the Secondary Plan policies are best suited to high density development and that a greater height and density will allow for a more meaningful response to the Landmark Gateway objectives both through architecture and the arrangement of the pedestrian realm. Given that the lands have 118 metres of frontage on Markham Road, and that the typical residential floor plate is roughly 30 metres across, there is roughly 88 metres on the Subject Lands where transition could be provided. This on-site transition, together with the 60 metres of frontage of Pottery Park, provides for a potential tower setback of 148 metres to the Markham Museum. In this regard, a 148 metre or 50 storey building would result in a roughly 1:1 relationship in tower height and setback with the Markham Museum and allows for transition. We believe that with a mid rise component on the southerly portion of the Subject Lands and a high rise component on the northerly portion, an FSI of 5.5 can be achieved and is appropriate.

It is relevant to note that the building height and floor space index permissions that have been applied by the City are not mutually implementable. The table below provides a summary of the resultant height and density when implementing either the maximum height or floor space index.

| 9408 - 9426 MARKHAM ROAD REDEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS | | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | MAXIMUM HEIGHT SCENARIO | MAXIMUM FSI SCENARIO |
| Site Area | 78, 000 m ² | 78, 000 m ² |
| Lot Coverage | 65% | 65% |
| Building Floor Area | 50,700 m ² | 50,700 m ² |
| Building Height | 8 storeys | 4.5 storeys |
| Total Gross Floor Area | 405,600 m ² | 228,150 m ² |
| Floor Space Index | 5.2 | 2.9 |

As is demonstrated above, if we assume a building coverage of 65 percent, an 8 storey building would result in a floor space index of 5.2 times lot coverage and a floor space index of 3.0 times lot coverage would result in a building that is approximately 4.5 storeys. Therefore, it is not possible to achieve an 8 storey built form and maintain a maximum floor space index of 3.0 times lot coverage and it is not possible to limit space index to 3.0 times lot coverage and achieve a maximum building height of 8 storeys as permitted. In this regard, we believe that the City’s density and height permissions may be flawed and require further review and assessment.

Allowing a greater height and density on the Subject Lands contributes to complete communities and the coordination of land use planning with transportation and infrastructure planning. Allowing ‘Mixed Use High Rise’ with consideration of the continuation of retail uses on the Subject lands will support the efficient use of land and resources and maximize housing options with convenient access to retail uses as well as active and public transportation infrastructure.

Conclusion

It is our opinion that the request for a maximum height of 50 storeys and an FSI of 5.5 for the Subject Lands is consistent with and conforms to Provincial Plans and policy, conforms to the Region of Peel Official Plan and City of Markham Official Plan and will contribute to implementing the goals and

objectives of the Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan. We respectfully request that Development Services Committee refer this matter back to staff allowing for further consultation and an opportunity to amend the MRMJ in a manner that addresses our client's concerns related to the permitted height and density contemplated for the Subject Lands.

We trust the above information is sufficient for the City of Markham Development Services Committee to consider the request for the Subject Lands. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rob Lavecchia', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Rob Lavecchia, BURPI, MCIP, RPP
Associate

From: Nancy E. Walton

Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 3:20 PM

To: Mayor Scarpitti <MayorScarpitti@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>;
Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <KRea@markham.ca>; Councillor, Andrew Keyes - Markham
<akeyes@markham.ca>

Subject: Strong Objection to the Markham Rd- Mount Joy Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Scarpitti, the Development Service Committee, Councillors Rae and Keyes:

As residents of Markham for 25 years, my husband and I have watched our beautiful city become a traffic-congested mess. We have far too many people living in a relatively small area. Often it takes close to 30 minutes to travel from old Markham Village to the 407, due to the massive number of vehicles on the road.

Traffic everywhere in Markham has become completely unacceptable and this includes the area along Markham Road between 16th and Major Mackenzie, which is apparent even before your proposed development.

We recently moved from old Markham Village to Swan Lake, since we love this city but with this proposed development, we may not be staying. It's no secret that the density of this area is soon to be double what is necessary.

The intersection at Markham Road and 16th has been a logistical nightmare for years, especially with the back up on 16th from the never-ending sewer work.

Living along 16th Avenue, we can tell you that emergency vehicles use 16th Avenue as a quick route to Markham Stouffville Hospital.

Which brings me to my next point, our fabulous local hospital is already bursting at the seams, the proposed development and the thousands of new residents will have a negative impact on our overstressed community hospital.

Please consider our concerns and those of the residents that already live here, before moving ahead with this proposal and the negative impact it will have on all of us.

Sincerely,

Nancy E. Walton
20 Kingfisher Cove Way
Markham, Ontario
L6E 1B4

From: Dave Clapperton
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 9:09 AM
To: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>
Subject: Re: Markham Rd - Mount Joy Secondary Plan update

CAUTION: This email originated from a source outside the City of Markham. DO NOT CLICK on any links or attachments, or reply unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Karen

I am not sure if my comments or anyone's comments will bring about a more reasonable outcome to the proposed expansion plan. There is obviously an agenda to increase the density of our area to ridiculous and impractical levels that ignores the significant negative reality and expected outcomes that residents of Markham and this particular area of Markham will have to live with forever. It would appear that the intention is to build up this corridor to levels that are not sustainable for its residents. Perhaps this is simply an opportunity to increase the tax coffers but it is extremely short sighted. We do not have the infrastructure to support that many new residents within a small area. We are already struggling with the congestion of our road systems, watermain and sewage systems. Our shopping malls and plazas are already bursting at the seams and I understand that further high rise development is slated for the Markville Mall area. Couple that with the poor driving habits within our area and we have the nightmare that we live with today. An prime example is the ongoing contruction and reconstruction of our sewer system along 16th Avenue. This has been a project that came and went and has come again and lingers providing traffic disruption and an eye sore for our community. The City already made a mistake with allowing an exit of the 407 onto Markham Road. We than did not widen Markham Road sufficiently to handle the trafiic flow into Main Street Markham from the 407. Thus, the hope for the diversion of traffic along Doanld Cousins Parkway has not happened and we have bumper to bumper traffic on Main Street. This is just another example of extremely poor planning and lack of foresight.

I can only imagine that we will now have to deal with extreme high rise condos as builders and the City look to maximize their investment and potential tax income. This does not fit with our community! Why is it that the residents can see this but the City and its planners can not?

In my opinion, and I am sure that it will be ignored, but it is time to allow the residents of Markham and this area of Markham, in particular, to live in peace and enjoy our City. I have lived in this area for almost 30 years and another 15 years in the Unionville area prior to that. We have dealt with widespread growth for most of that time. Just to the west of us Unionville is looking at huge developments in the former York Downs Golf Course area and to our north Major Mackenzie is slated for more development. It is time for council and it splanning department to listen and step back and see things for how they are and will be for their residents rather than simply push things to limits that make no sense and will result in the disintegration of a community that has such potential. Go ahead and put in more parks and paths for residents. By all means look for ways to improve the economics of our area to minimize tax increases. But please do not do this on the backs of the residents of our area.

Just the thoughts of a long time resident.
Dave Clapperton
47 Grove Road



April 19, 2024

City of Markham
Community Planning and Development Services Branch
101 Town Centre Boulevard
Markham, ON
L3R 9W3

Attn: Ms. Lily-Ann D'Souza

Dear Ms. D'Souza,

**Re: Markham Road- Mount Joy Secondary Plan: Final Study and Draft Policy Framework
Comments
9999 Markham Road
City of Markham**

Evans Planning acts on behalf of 2585231 Ontario Inc., the Owner of the property legally described as 'Part of Lot 20, Concession 8, City of Markham', and municipally known as 9999 Markham Road (the 'subject property'). The subject property is located on the east side of Markham Road, south of Major Mackenzie Drive East. The property is currently vacant, and has a total lot area of approximately 12.84 hectares (31.7 acres).

The Owner has previously submitted multiple applications to facilitate the redevelopment of the subject property, including:

- Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision, approved by City of Markham Council at its meeting on December 10, 2019 (City File: ZA/SU 18 180621). The implementing amendment was approved as By-law 2019-139 on December 20, 2019.
- Site Plan Control approval for the first phase of the proposed development (Phase 1A) (City file SPC 19 127869)
- Zoning By-law Amendment for a subsequent phase (Phase 1C) to permit a 12-storey mid-rise building, deemed complete on December 22, 2021 (City file: PLAN 21 147900)

Additional applications to amend the Zoning By-law, as well as for Site Plan Control will be required for future phases of the proposed development.

The Owner has been an active participant in the Secondary Plan process, and has provided comments at prior Development Services Committee meetings, as well as the various workshops and open houses held by the City, including written correspondence related the previous Draft OPA in October 2023 and verbal

comments at the November 2023 DSC Meeting. We appreciate the opportunity to review the updated draft Official Plan Amendment and responses to our prior comments, and wish to provide the following for your consideration on behalf of our Client:

Amendments to Markham Official Plan (2014) (the 'MOP')

Policy/Figure 9.3.6:

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 continue to 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 request 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. This would be consistent with the approach taken in Map 14, wherein the desired general location of future parks are identified with a coloured dot.

The Staff response to our prior comment on this matter does not address this concern.

Policy 9.3.7.2:

We continue to suggest that 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. While Staff are correct in noting that these lands are outside of the urban boundary, this does not negate the fact that the basis of large portions of the Secondary Plan are predicated on the location of such a station. Accordingly, we feel it would be appropriate to reference it in some manner.

Maps 1, 2, and 3:

We object to the partial redesignation of the property from 'mixed use' to 'residential' and request that the 'mixed use' designation be retained for all portions of the subject property west of Anderson Avenue within the both Secondary Plan and MOP.

Greenway System/Natural Heritage Network/Valleyland/Mapping

Thank you for confirming that the limits of the Greenway System correspond with the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision (DPOS). Notwithstanding this, our comment pertaining to the ultimate use of Block 5 on the DPOS remains valid, and has been recognized through provisions of the Subdivision Agreement. We continue to request that any mapping associated with the Secondary Plan denote that this Block is 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.

Draft Secondary Plan

Mobility/Vehicle Parking Rate (Section 7.1.4)

The intent to address parking requirements through the implementing Zoning By-law and Parking Strategy is noted, however the timing of same is unknown at the present time. Particularly given the intent of the Province related to parking supplies in proximity to higher order transit as outlined in Bill 185, we request that

the policies related to parking within the Secondary Plan demonstrate the City's commitment to sustainability by framing such requirements in the context of 'maximum' parking rates, rather than 'minimum' rates.

Community Structure – North Precinct

We appreciate the revision to the community structure and land use plans to recognize the provision of mixed-uses along Major Mackenzie Drive (MMD) and Markham Road. Notwithstanding this, the extent of same should be noted to be conceptual given that the internal layout of the laneway network that could comprise future phases of development on the subject property remains unknown at the present time.

Please also refer to our prior comments related to the ultimate use of Block 5.

Parks System (Section 3.1.8)

Refer to our above comments above related to the size, configuration, and location of the future park contemplated in future phases of the development of 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).

Greenway System:

While we note the response from Staff regarding the extent of the Greenway System, we reiterate our prior comments related to Block 5 on the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision. The ultimate use of this Block has not been determined, and the Owner reserves the right to potentially permit redevelopment of these lands through a future application process. The City has acknowledged same through the language of the Subdivision Agreement.

Compact Community (Policies 5.1.1-5.1.4)

Please clarify how this Section may need to be revised/updated if a second GO Station is established?

We continue to note that 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 along the Stouffville Rail Corridor.

On this basis, we continue to suggest that consideration for greater heights and densities at this intersection would be appropriate as a 'secondary node' within the Secondary Plan to avoid the potential need for future amendment to the Plan. While this appears to have partially been addressed through the inclusion of Site-Specific Policy 9.1, we feel that it is important the overall structure of the Secondary Plan also address this potential addition which would significantly impact the nature of the area.

Affordable Housing

We support the inclusion of Policy 8.7.5 in order to incentivize the creation of affordable housing units by exempting the gross floor area associated with same from the calculation of height and density, however suggest that this should be expanded further. Given the realities of construction – specifically that the cost to build an affordable unit is no different than the cost to build a market unit - 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 continue to suggest that the target of 25% of new housing units being affordable, is laudable but may be unrealistic. Further 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). Similarly, the target exceeds the ultimate requirements of the Inclusionary Zoning policies for the strongest market area adopted by Council for the City of Toronto, which are to be phased in over the course of several years.

Given the uncertainty inherent in the development process, the time it takes to bring a project to conclusion, and the general market uncertainty, requiring such an onerous target may lead to the cancellation of existing or planned projects, or developers seeking other opportunities for development outside of the Secondary Plan Area and/or City of Markham. This uncertainty would also make providing the details required in the ‘housing impact statement’ provided in Policy 5.1.8(b) difficult to provide with any degree of certainty.

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.

We are also concerned that the Secondary Plan does not include reference to ‘attainable’ or ‘intrinsically affordable’ units. We feel that increasing the diversity and supply of housing options through the provision of apartment, townhouse, stacked townhouse, and other innovative design options is a crucial element in creating not only a complete and diverse community, but also contributes to the inherent affordability of said community by providing options for all income levels. Alternative forms of housing can be considered affordable when compared to the relatively limited supply of traditional forms of ground related housing, although may not meet the strict definition of ‘affordable’.

Multi-Use Trail (Policy 5.2.1 and 6.1.23)

We continue to request consideration of parkland credit for the multi-use trail which is to be installed along the rail corridor on the subject property, which is likely to be a unique condition within the Secondary Plan area given it is a publicly accessible multi-use trail that has been provided at the request of the City over lands which are to remain privately owned and form part of a condominium. Given this facility would establish

an active transportation function that would offset demand from local parks, and provides easier access to a potential future GO Station, consideration of a credit applied towards parkland requirements is equitable.

Pedestrian Crossings (Policy 6.1.4)

While we acknowledge the response of Staff, in that the precise location of the pedestrian crossing indicated on Schedules SP1 and SP7 is subject to further study, it remains shown on our Client's lands, and more specifically within Phase 1A of the proposed development, for which Zoning has been approved, and which is to be of common element condominium tenure.

We reiterate that if public access is contemplated over the pedestrian walkway proposed through our Client's development west of the rail corridor further details must be provided in relation to how maintenance and liability are to be handled in order to minimize potential costs and risk to the future condominium corporation and the residents therein.

Streets and Blocks (Policy 6.1.8, 7.1.1, 7.1.2, and SP6)

We appreciate the response of Staff, however suggest that the Policies of Section 7.1.2.4 do not address our concern. We continue to request that further language be included to clarify that any future street network (being those not already approved as part of the Draft Plan of Subdivision, or Site Plan Control application for Phase 1A) on the subject property as shown on schedules to the Secondary Plan are conceptual only, and are not to be construed as an accepted ultimate alignment or tenure of right-of-way.

Streetscapes

We acknowledge that the details required to substantiate appropriate soil volumes are a matter for detailed design, however continue to suggest that the appropriate City Standards should be reviewed in conjunction with Policies 6.1.12, 13, and 14, to ensure that it is functionally viable to provide same. We also suggest that consideration for allowing low impact development measures (LIDs) within the boulevard of a public right-of-way should be considered to help offset the impact of the extension of future roads without the need to resort to downstream measures such as storm ponds. These measures could also be beneficial to the pedestrian realm and contribute to increased naturalization of the community.

Public Art

We suggest that to expedite approval and provide certainty to proponents, the provision of Public Art as an 'in kind' contribution for the purposes of the Community Benefits Charge (CBC) By-law or successor, should be permitted as-of-right.

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 acknowledge the response of Staff, but continue to suggest that the proposed tower separation of 30-metres as provided in Policy 6.1.34 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.

Markham Road

We appreciate the response of Staff with respect to the need for a future EA. Notwithstanding this, given the recent announcements by the Province, we request clarification as to whether an EA is still a required process?

Residential Mid- and High-Rise

Please clarify whether the permission for 'stacked' townhouses include back-to-back stacked units?

Public Park (Policies 8.5.1-8.5.3)

Refer to our comments above. Our Client reiterates their intent 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. Accordingly, please confirm if the park anticipated within future phases on the subject property is the 'Parkette' identified in Policy 8.5.3(j)?

Height and Density (Section 8.7)

We appreciate the revisions to the schedules to make the applicable Height and Density more legible, however note that the built form identified for the lands comprising the proposed Phase 1C development does not comply with the application made in December 2021 (pending as City File PLAN 21 147900). The initial application proposed a 12-storey apartment building (exclusive of mechanical penthouse) with an anticipated density of 3.15 FSI, whereas the Secondary Plan proposes 10-storeys and 3.0 FSI. We request that for these lands, the schedules be revised to indicate a maximum height of 12-storeys and 3.15 FSI.

We further request that the Secondary Plan clarify what constitutes a 'storey' in order to provide certainty with respect to how rooftop access and amenity levels, and internal mezzanines may be considered. Additionally, in instances where above-grade parking is necessary due to groundwater or other context conditions (such as an elevated right of way), would these levels be considered as 'storeys'?

Generally, we find the density provision on Appendix 2 are too low to actually permit the intended height, and question how these were determined. Specifically, given the detailed plans provided as part of the above-referenced application, a maximum FSI of 3.0 for mid-rise buildings is insufficient, and request that it be increased to 5.0-5.5 to allow flexibility.

Please clarify if it is anticipated that the provisions of Policy 8.7.3 would apply to lands around a future GO Station at Major Mackenzie Drive as well? Additionally, we question why additional height should be limited to only 5-storeys beyond what is shown in the Secondary Plan if it can be demonstrated that all other aspects of the Plan are met.

See also our prior comments related to Policy 8.7.5.

Policy 9.1

We support this Policy 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.

Please also provide clarification with respect to which height/density would apply for lands with frontage onto both Streets. We suggest it be the greater.

We also suggest that the provided densities of 7.5 and 7.0 FSI is insufficient to accommodate the anticipated heights and built form.

Implementation

A policy should be added to Section 10.2 similar to 10.4.3.

For the purposes of Section 10.2 (Developers Group Agreement) and 10.4 (Parkland Dedication and Master Parkland Agreement), we feel the City must take an active role in coordinating the initial formation of the Group given the multitude of Owners across the Plan Area.

Map SP3

We request that the block of land abutting Anderson Road at the southern boundary of the property currently labelled as 6-storeys be increased. This is consistent with concept plans previously provided to Staff.

Should you require any additional information, please contact the writer at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,



Adam Layton, MCIP, RPP

cc. Mr. Giulio Cescato City of Markham
Mr. Darryl Lyons, City of Markham
Mr. Duran Wedderburn, City of Markham
Mr. Stephen Lue, City of Markham
Ms. Stacia Muradali, City of Markham
2585231 Ontario Inc.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marvin Tang**

Date: Fri, Apr 19, 2024 at 11:22 AM

Subject: Response to the Final Study Report of Markham Road Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study

To: <joeli@markham.ca>, <alan.ho@markham.ca>, <kirish@markham.ca>, <RitchLau@markham.ca>, <rmcalpine@markham.ca>, Councillor Karen Rea <krea@markham.ca>, <akeyes@markham.ca>, <jnathan@markham.ca>, <ilee@markham.ca>

Cc: <kwilson@markham.ca>, <coombs@markham.ca>, <neerac@markham.ca>, <sxie@markham.ca>, <lpatton@markham.ca>, <ntang@markham.ca>, <mantonoglou@markham.ca>, <sjinasena@markham.ca>, <mgibbons@markham.ca>, <animalraj@markham.ca>, <pho@markham.ca>

Hi Councilors,

I am glad that Markham residents have you, who are bringing the opportunities to the City and making our city better and better.

I have the following questions regarding the Final Study Report of Markham Road Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study dated September 2023.

1. The City of Markham Official Plan was published in 2014. Does the plan consider the current situation and the future? Right now, we have a new development under construction north of Major Mackenzie Road (Angus Glen South Village). The land between Major Mackenzie Rd and 19th Ave will also be developed in the future, according to the York Region Official Plan (2022). If the Markham official plan does not consider these, how can you draw the Markham Rd - Mount Joy Secondary Plan on top of it?

2. The plan area is at the northeast edge of the residential area in Markham. Most traffic is heading west and south in the morning and coming back in the evening. Keep in mind, The Markham Road has narrow parts in the Markham heritage area (two-lane wide in total), and in between hwy7 and 407 (three-lane wide in total). The traffic planning should count this, and provide a solution, based on current conditions and future development.

In HDR's Final Transportation Report dated June 15, 2023, I did not see the consideration of the traffic from the future developments north of Major Mackenzie Road.

Also, this report is based on many assumptions we may not be able to realize.

1) Two-way all-day GO service to Mount Joy GO station (with a 15-minute frequency to Mount Joy as the ultimate desired service level, though this is not part of the GO Expansion program).

2) A potential GO station at Major Mackenzie Drive.

3) Rapid transit on Major Mackenzie Drive is NOT currently identified in the Region's 2023 10-year roads and Capital Construction Program.

Based on all the above questions, I don't think the traffic report is qualified. While the secondary plan is based on this traffic report.

Also, What should be emphasized is WHO will pay for the GO station at Major MacKenzie Rd, The City, Or the Metrolinx?

3. For the newly added 33,000 population in this small area, Markham Stouffville Hospital (MSH) is their only choice. From the 16th Ave & Markham Rd intersection, It is 24km to North York General Hospital, and nearly 36km to Southlake Regional Health Centre, comparing 4km to MSH. Is MSH ready for the new added population and more from future developments? If a new hospital or upgrade is required, is there a plan, and most important thing, where is the money?

4. In the Secondary Plan, I did not see an expansion/upgrade of Mount Joy Community Centre. By adding nearly 1/10 of the current total population in Markham to this small area, but ignoring their needs for the community center, I don't think it is a good plan.

Definitely, our City needs development, and therefore, the municipal services should be expanded/upgraded, or added/built new accordingly. but, **where is the budget plan? Who will pay for it? Do we have enough money? Is the plan financially feasible?**

My point is, that when we approve the developer's plan, save enough money from the plan-related income for the required upgrade of the health system, the traffic system, and other municipal services, rather than cutting a big portion of the city tax income to patch the hole in the future. Without a healthy financial plan and support, nothing can be realized.

Looking forward to the new traffic plan, financial plan, and updated MRMJSP.

The City needs development, based on scientific and rigorous planning.

We should build a monument to those who brought development to the city so that when people enjoy the benefits of MRMJSP, they will remember these names.

They also say names when stuck in traffic or crowded emergency waiting rooms. Just kidding.

But a registered vote is necessary, so people know who contributed to the City's development.

All best wishes.

Marvin