

April 22, 2024
HPGI File # 18533

SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL: clerkspublic@markham.ca

Development Services Committee

101 Town Centre Blvd.
Markham, ON
L3R 9W3

Attn: City Clerk

**Re: Item 9.1 – Recommendation Report Development Service Committee Meeting
City Initiated OPA for Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan
City File: PR20 142832
Objections on behalf of Meadowpark Investments (BT) Inc.**

Humphries Planning Group Inc. (HPGI) is the planning consultant for Meadowpark Investments (BT) Inc., the owner of the property located at 77 Anderson Avenue (the 'Subject Site'), in the City of Markham. It is noted that Meadowpark Investments (BT) Inc. support the general direction of the Mount Joy Secondary Plan in terms of it's visionary additions of heights and densities to an otherwise low-density area. This letter provides comments on the Staff Report Recommendation item and associated Appendices.

Property Description

The Subject Site is located on the north side of Bur Oak Avenue, east of Anderson Avenue, and immediately abuts the Metrolinx/CN Rail Line to the east. The Subject Site is approximately 0.45 hectares (1.13 acres) in area, with a frontage of approximately 45 metres along Anderson Avenue and 99 metres along Bur Oak Avenue. The Subject Site is currently occupied by a car wash business. The Subject Site is surrounded by a mix of commercial and employment uses to the north and west. An established residential neighbourhood is located east of the Subject Site, beyond the Metrolinx/CN Rail line, which predominantly consists of low scale residential dwellings. South of the Subject Site is the Mount Joy GO Station and parking areas.

Meadowpark Investments (BT) Inc. Development Proposal

In November 2021 Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law

Amendment were submitted to permit the development of 30-storey mixed-use (residential/commercial) development on the Subject Site. On March 27, 2023 a revised application proposed a 45-storey mixed-use (commercial/residential) condominium building with four (4) levels of underground parking was submitted to the City. An additional Public Meeting was held on May 23, 2023. The amended application is currently under review.

Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan

Our review of the draft Secondary Plan document has found inconsistencies between the Maps themselves and the proposed policies that need to be addressed. Further to such, it is our opinion that the subject site has been designated incorrectly, assigned the incorrect land use policies. These matters are outlined below in detail and separated out between Mapping and Land Use Policy matters .

A) Mapping

1. Amendment to Map 1 – Markham Structure as related to Maps SP1 and SP2

This Map indicates that the subject site is being redesignated from “Employment Area” to “Mixed Use Neighbourhood Area”. Maps SP1 And SP2 illustrate a blue colour area for the site and legend reads as “Mid- Rise Employment Priority”.

There is confusion in this matter as the lands did receive an employment area conversion from the Region of York as part of its completed MCR process. The proposed “Mid Rise Employment Priority” designation is not appropriate as this implies that subject site remains designated for employment uses only. We request that Maps SP1 and SP2 be revised to designate the subject site as “Mixed Use High Rise”.

2. Amendment to Map 3 – Land Use Discrepancy between the Legend and the Plan

This map in the plan area shows the subject site as a solid blue colour and there is no reference to such in the legend. There is a blue hatched code in the legend that does not apply to anywhere on the map itself. Therefore the Map needs to be corrected.

3. Map SP1, SP2 as related to Map SP3 and Appendix 2 (Density)

Maps SP1 and SP2 reference the subject site as Mid Rise – Employment Priority. Maps SP3 and Appendix 2 assign a building height of 30 storeys and 7.0 FSI. Based on 30 storeys and 7.0 FSI the “Mid-Rise” designation is not correct. A “High-Rise” designation should be applied. In addition to thereto we also request that the Map SP3 be revised to illustrate a building height of 45 storeys and Appendix 2 be revised to allow for a density of 8.9 FSI as currently proposed in the applications for the subject site.

4. Map SP5 – Natural Heritage Features as related to the TRCA Framework

The 2022 Regulation Area and 2022 Floodplain Area have been attempted to be illustrated on the map. However, the layering of these items has made it confusing, if not impossible to determine what areas on the map are subject to the Floodplain itself. We request that this Map be revised to clearly illustrate the limits of the Floodplain.

B) Land Use Policies

5. Section 8.1.2 – Land Use

Section 8.1.2 of the Draft Secondary Plan establishes land use designations which are derived from Map SP2. We note that SP2 proposes a land use designation of “Mid Rise – Employment Priority” and Section 8.1.2 has no corresponding land use category. Section 8.1.2 only has a “Mixed Use Mid Rise Employment Priority” land use designation. The discrepancy between MAP SP2 and Section 8 needs to be reconciled prior to adoption/approval of the document.

6. Mixed Use High Rise – Employment Priority is not included on Map SP2 or as a land use designation

The subject land has a land use planning application in process which proposes 45 storeys and 8.9 FSI. It is noted that MAP SP3 already provides building height of 45 storeys directly opposite the subject site on the south side of Bur Oak Avenue. We request that MAP SP3 be revised to reflect the same height on the subject site and Appendix 2 Density be revised to reflect a density of 8.9 FS1. We further request that MAP SP2 be revised to reflect a Mixed Use High Rise land use designation.

7. Section 8.3.2 – Mixed Use Mid Rise - Employment Priority

8.3.2.1

We are concerned that the policies proposed in this land use designation are too restrictive in nature as they do not provide the appropriate flexibility for mixed use development on the subject site as currently proposed. The document currently states *“The intent of the designation is to broaden the light industrial, warehousing, small office and retail and service uses historically permitted on the lands while introducing compatible and complementary non-employment uses to promote transit supportive development adjacent to the Mount Joy GO Station.”* However in Section 8.3.2.1 under General Policies the document states:

“c) require at-grade building designs that contain appropriate industrial ceiling heights to accommodate commercial loading docks, ventilation, power, proper separating and potential mezzanine space to support active productive activities on the ground floor;

d) provide opportunities for commercial and office uses in upper storeys of new development”

It is our opinion that policies c) and d) should be revised to include the wording “*where appropriate*” as not all development applications should be required to include these elements.

e) provide opportunities to incorporate residential uses as discretionary uses in upper storeys of new development”

This policy should be revised to state that residential uses are encouraged in upper storeys of new development subject to addressing criteria in Section 8.3.2.2.

g) prohibit standalone residential uses and residential uses at-grade”

This policy should be revised to remove the word “prohibit”. Determination of at grade uses is best determined in a site by site basis.

8. Section 8.3.2.2- Discretionary Uses vs Section 8.3.2.4 permitted land uses

Section 8.3.2.2 requires that a zoning application be filed and various criteria be addressed in order permit residential uses. Section 8.3.2.5 does permit residential units in upper floors of mixed use buildings. However, Section 8.3.2.4 does not. Section 8.3.2.4 should be revised to include mixed use buildings containing residential uses provided that criteria in Section 8.3.2.2 are addressed.

9. Request for Mixed use High Rise Land Use Designation for the Subject Site (Section 8.3.3)

In light of the comments noted above and #8 regarding 8.3.2.2 and 8.3.2.4 in particular, it would also be appropriate to revise the MAPs SP1 and SP2 for the subject site to provide for a “Mixed Use High Rise” land use designation which is already proposed for the lands to the west of Anderson Avenue. The proposed land use application for the subject site accommodates non residential uses at grade with residential in the storeys above. Review and comparison of the proposed permitted land uses in Section 8.3.3.2 vs those in 8.3.2.4 of the employment priority area indicates a large duplication of land uses which could be accommodated within the

project. It is our opinion that some of the uses proposed for the employment priority such as *light manufacturing, processing and warehousing* area would not be appropriate for the subject site given its locational attribute of being located across the street from the Mount Joy Go Station with direct frontage on both Bur Oak Avenue and Anderson Avenue.

Should a detailed discussion with staff be required to further clarify the above noted matters we would be please to undertake a meeting to do so.

Yours truly,

HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Rosemarie L. Humphries', written over a horizontal line.

Rosemarie L. Humphries BA, MCIP, RPP
President

cc. *Meadowpark Investments (BT) Inc.*

April 22, 2024
HPGI File # 15412

SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL: clerkspublic@markham.ca

Development Services Committee
101 Town Centre Blvd.
Markham, ON
L3R 9W3

Attn: City Clerk

Re: Letter of Objection on behalf of Krashnik Investments Limited
April 23rd 2024 Development Service Committee Meeting
Item 9.1 Recommendation Report City Initiated OPA
Markham Road – Mount Joy Secondary Plan
City File Number- PR 20 142832

Humphries Planning Group Inc (HPGI) is the planning consultant for Krashnik Investments Limited, the registered owners of the lands municipally addressed as 9833 and 9829 Markham Road, in the City of Markham (the 'Subject Lands'). HPGI has submitted correspondence, on behalf of our clients on numerous occasions, outlining a number of concerns in relation to the Mount Joy Secondary Plan Study as well as participated in and attended several DSC meetings held by the City on this matter in addition to individual meetings with Planning Staff. Based on our review of the staff Recommendation Report and proposed Official Plan Amendment referred to as Appendix 2 it appears that our comments and objections as previously expressed relating to the proposed distribution of land uses have yet to be fully addressed and we object to many aspects of the City's secondary plan amendment including proposed land use and policies including, without limitation, those outlined below

Section 4.1 Greenway System states that it is the City's intention to have valley lands conveyed into public ownership and in particular a realigned Mount Joy Creek that will be the subject of

future study and possibly an Environmental Assessment. The Greenway System which includes a realigned Mount Joy Creek is depicted on MAP SP4. Section 4.3 Water Resources and Mount Joy Creek proposes policies which require the confirmation of the realignment of Mount Joy Creek as shown on Map SP4 as related to its location, size and extent. Additional Greenway designation policies are located in Section 8.4.

We are opposed to any realignment of the Mount Joy Creek from its current state that is not covered and aligned underneath Anderson Avenue within the subject lands. The proposed realignment of the water course in an open manner will result in a loss of development area of the subject lands and potentially unsafe condition. Further to such, there is no rationale provided for requiring said lands be conveyed into public ownership and then used as a basis to accommodate further lands adjacent thereto for a multi use trail and 3.5m vegetative buffer as outlined in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 under Section 5.4 Open Space System and further illustrated in MAP SP7.

Section 5.2 Community Infrastructure and Services indicates that public/private facilities inclusive of parks and schools should be located and designed to act as community hubs. The park and school locations proposed on the subject lands are not appropriate as they do not create a community hub. Parks and schools should be located in areas where higher density areas such as the Mount Joy Go Station Mixed Use Area. This area will more likely function as a community hub and yet there is only a minor park and no community infrastructure and services proposed for this area of the plan.

Policy 5.2.10 provides an underlying land use designation of school sites which may be implemented should a school site not be required or relocated on the basis that a zoning application is filed and approved. We object to this policy as related to the requirement of filing a zoning application as it is penalizing the affected land owner in an unnecessary manner. Correspondence from the school board indicating no interest in the site or property should provide sufficient clearance without the need for a zoning application to be filed.

It is further noted that additional institutional policies are located in Section 8.6. Section 8.6.4 clearly states that residential uses are permitted if integrated with a public school in a multi-storey mixed use building. However, Section 8.6.5 restricts building types to only for places of worship, public schools and community infrastructure facilities. Section 8.6.5 needs to be revised to include residential mixed use buildings.

Similar to Policy 5.2.10 noted above, Policy 5.3.6 also provides underlying land use designations which may be implemented if the park is not required or relocated elsewhere subject to a

zoning application being filed. We object to this policy as related to the requirement of filing a zoning application as it is penalizing the affected land owner in an unnecessary manner.

Policies 8.1.6 and 10.2 encourage development proponents to enter into one or developers group agreements to ensure equitable distribution of costs for community and infrastructure facilities. We object to these policies as currently written as they provide no guarantee that the subject site which currently has community facilities and infrastructure inclusive of school, park, arterial road, 3.5m buffer to protect for the future electrification of Go Rail Service, multi use trail etc will be appropriately compensated for as all these items benefit multiple landowners. Multiple Official and Secondary Plans across York Region and other municipalities require proof that an owner is a member in good standing of a landowner cost sharing group as a condition of final development approval. Such a policy ensures that there are mechanisms in place to compensate for community infrastructure and facilities which benefit multiple landowners and should be incorporated into this Secondary Plan. We further note that proposed secondary plan policy 10.4.3 requires developers group clearance regarding parkland obligations as a condition of approval. In order to implement such a developers group would need to be formed and cost sharing obligations determined.

Section 8.7 addresses matters of Height and Density and in particular would allow up to 5 storeys of additional height above the maximums shown on MAP SP3 for the "Mixed Use-High Rise" designation in the Mount Joy Major Transit Station Area in accordance with policy 8.7.3. We object to this policy as currently written. Section 6.1.27 states that appropriate height peaks and transitions throughout the secondary plan area including a) primary height and density peaks within the Mount Joy Go Station Mixed Use Node; and b) secondary height and density peaks along the length of Markham Road, between Major Mackenzie and Edward Jeffreys Avenue. It is appropriate to provide for 5 storeys of additional height to all lands fronting onto Markham Road corridor and we request that policy 8.7.3 be revised to indicate such.

Section 10.4.1 respecting the implementation of Parkland Dedication and a Master Parkland Agreement states that developers shall be encouraged to enter into a Master Parkland Agreement with the City prior to development approvals being granted with the Secondary Plan Area. However, Section 10.4.3 indicates that a condition of approval of any lands in the Secondary Plan area will be subject to a Master Parkland Agreement and the development will be required to provide confirmation from a developers group that the developer has satisfied all their parkland obligations regarding the Master Parkland Agreement. Section 10.4.1 should be revised to properly reflect the intent of Policy 10.4.3 as currently written.

There is no rationale for the the distribution of heights in a east-west direction through the subject lands and the secondary plan area as identified on MAP SP3 (Height). Lands backing

onto park on the west side of Markham Road have 8 storeys of height assigned. The same situation for the subject site on the east side of Markham Road only provides 3 storeys. We object to such and request that the proposed 3 storey heights on the subject site be modified to at least 8 storeys. We further object to a height limitation of 15 storeys along Markham Road and request that a minimum of 20 storeys be assigned at this location. A minimum height of 20 storeys for the subject lands fronting on Markham Road will still provide a gradation in height along the Markham Road corridor between Major Mackenzie Drive to the north and Edwards Jeffreys Avenue to the south as is intended based on policy 6.1.27 noted previously above.

Review of Appendix 2 (Density) as related to the subject lands fronting onto Markham Road and comparing with the opposite side of Markham Road further indicates a discrepancy in density proposed for the subject site when compared to MAP SP3 Height. The lands directly across Markham Road from the subject lands have a density of 7 FSI and Height of 15 storeys whereas the subject lands have a height of 15 storeys and only an FSI of 3.5. We object to such and request that Appendix 2 Density be revised to reflect a minimum density of 7 for the area of the subject lands fronting Markham Road.

As always, our client remains available to meet with Staff to discuss their concerns respecting the draft policy document in greater detail. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.



Rosemarie Humphries BA, MCIP, RPP
President

cc. Krashnik Investments Limited
Ms. Susan Rosenthal, Davies Howe

From: Dianne More

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 3:29 PM

To: Mayor & Councillors <mayorandcouncillors@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: Mount Joy Secondary Plan - Development Services Meeting - April 23, 2024

Mayor Scarpitti and Council,

As longtime residents and advocates for the heritage of Markham Village, we are submitting this to the Development Services Committee to express our objection to aspects of the Mount Joy Secondary Plan that will lead to the degradation of Markham Village and the area from 16th Avenue to Major Mackenzie Drive --- in terms of the Heritage of Main Street Markham **and** the quality of life for residents in the intensification area.

We are supporting Councillor Rea's objections to the increased population level of 33000 residents (from 13500?) , the decrease of jobs to 8000 (from 14500?), and the increase of land from 90 to 97 hectares.

Doubling the density of an area that is required in a Major Transit Station Area is **unjustifiable** --- especially when it is not needed to meet the growth targets set by the Provincial government. The City of Markham has wisely planned to exceed targets by 2051 without the proposed intensification targets of this Secondary Plan.

Where is the planning for infrastructure --- especially traffic?

We have an opportunity to create a vibrant area which will draw people to green spaces and public squares --- and hopefully, affordable housing for our young people and new residents --- **but, we need to do this right, and not cram excessive people and cars into an area that cannot sustain this level of development.**

We do not want a concrete jungle/tunnel of high-rise condominiums lining Markham Road.

We are counting on our elected leaders to lead --- and make rational decisions that incorporate the wishes of longtime residents. We have the best interests of our community at heart --- and have supported Markham Village for 50+ years.

Respectfully,

Dianne & Alan More

From: Dianne More

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 4:17 PM

To: Mayor Scarpitti <MayorScarpitti@markham.ca>; Mayor & Councillors
<mayorandcouncillors@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Erika Stevenson; Donna Wigmore; Wayne Moss; Fil Bayne; Andrew Fuyarchuk; Annette Ali; Ken Rudy; Linaire and David Armstrong; Kugan Subramaniam

Subject: Mount Joy Secondary Plan - April 23, 2024

Mayor Scarpitti and Council,

On behalf of the Markham Village Conservancy, I am submitting this email in support of Councillor Karen Rea's objections to the proposed level of intensification in the current Mount Joy Secondary Plan.

As a volunteer organization that has championed the Heritage of Markham Village since 1996, we have a vested interest in ensuring the development of the area from 16th Avenue to Major Mackenzie Drive complements the efforts of so many residents and organizations (Heritage Markham, the City Heritage Planners, Old Markham Village Ratepayers, Vinegar Hill Ratepayers...) over many decades on Main Street Markham from Vinegar Hill to Mount Joy..

We are in agreement that the level of intensification currently proposed in the Mount Joy Secondary Plan will have a detrimental effect on the Heritage Conservation District and does not reflect the innovative planning that could create a balancing entrance to the Old Village.

We have a chance to create an entrance thoroughfare that welcomes visitors from the north into the Village and supports the Main Street Markham Vision.

It is vital that we are cognizant of the necessity to protect the Heritage we have fought so long to secure --- it is a priceless asset that we cannot afford to jeopardize.

Markham has been recognized internationally with the awarding of the first Prince of Wales (King Charles III) Prize in 1999 --- with the contribution of the Markham Village Conservancy's initiatives.

The Markham Village Conservancy is urging the Mayor and Council to mitigate any negative effects to the Mount Joy/16th Avenue/Major Mackenzie Drive area by decreasing the density currently being proposed and allowing for some imaginative planning to enhance the northern entrance to our historic Village.

Respectfully,

Dianne More and the Markham Village Conservancy.

From: D. W..

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 9:35 AM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>; D. W..

Subject: Mount Joy Markham Secondary Plan Apr. 23 meeting.

Hi,

I fully support our Councilor Karen Rea in her objections to the massive intensification north of 16th Ave.

I hope there is enough fire stations available and consideration of train derailment possibilities.

I would like to see the City plan more Cornells being designed to deal with affordable housing and intensification.

I would also like to see a City of Markham Town Office satellite here in the east.

The City of Markham won the first Prince of Wales Award in the world for its Heritage Districts. This Secondary plan for Mount Joy Markham contains the city's own Museum by Heritage Estates and abuts the Mount Joy- Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

Cornell was developed for intensification, using Neo- Traditional Planning expertise and was named after early settlers to Markham.

The City sees Markham sees itself as a major tourist destination, setting up Destination Markham, a municipal corporation to promote visitors and businesses. The Village of Unionville is marketed widely.

Since we as Canadians are duty bound by the King of England and any new immigrant must pledge allegiance to the Crown, so with this section of Markham Road that is Hwy 48, the **Kings Highway**, I think it is important to respect the King's views on development. King Charles obviously has the world's best planners advising his foundation. I think there is an opportunity here worth review.

Please see the pdf <https://d16zhuza4xzjgx.cloudfront.net/files/princesfoundation2017-buildingalegacyalandownersguidetopopulardevelopment2-5fb002da.pdf>

We are NOT Mississauga. We are Markham. A city that the King thought was the best in the world for Heritage. No where is there a Village that has a Museum on the north and a National Rouge Park on the south that can be a major destination that is pedestrian friendly and community oriented.

I would ask council to have their planning department review the King's Foundation for any highlights that will enhance this development in unison with the Heritage Conservation Districts and Cornell, Markham's first attempt at intensification.

Thank you for your time.

Thank you,

Donna Knight
Old Markham Village Conservancy, Inc.
Markham Village Conservancy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Eddy Y

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 12:38 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: Need more roads going north and south.

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.

To whom it may concern,

Currently kennedy, mccowan and markham roads are very congested. If the city is growing with more jobs and housing, we need more roads in between these roads. For example, there's midland, brimley and middlefield ave in scarborough on top of the roads mentioned above.

Thanks Eddy

Sent from my iPhone

From: Elisabeth Tan

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 5:51 PM

To: Mayor, Councillors & C.A.O. <MayorCouncillors&C.A.O@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: DSC meeting April 23, 2024-item 10.1-Recommendation Report, City initiated Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road-Mt. 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.

Dear Mayor & Councillors,

After reading the Recommendation Report, City initiated Official Plan Amendment for the Markham Road-Mt. Joy Secondary Plan, I am very disappointed with the recommendations.

Markham Rd/Mt. Joy Secondary Plan will have a minimum of 33,000 residents by 2051 and only 6000 jobs. Where is the balance between Live-Work-Play? There will be 9 parks planned with a total of 9.8 hectares of land. These parks will be tiny parks for this population growth!

How about proper recreation and community centres?

2 New schools are planned (Secondary and Elementary schools?). Daycare centres and Medical centres are also needed.

Our Markham Stouffville Hospital is already used to its maximum capacity with long wait times. We also need more Retirement homes and Nursing homes in the near future. Any plans for these institutions?

Metrolinx has no future funding for the Mt. Joy Go Line and there won't be a World Class Transit system for this area in the near future! No BRT or LRT.

Is Mt. Joy a Transit Oriented Development area? Not everyone is going downtown. How about east/west destinations?

So, people are forced to take their cars to go places on the already congested roads! It's a long drive to the expensive Hwy 407 and Hwy 404!

We trust that our Staff and Councillors do their due diligence and CAN NOT approve the Markham Rd-Mt. Joy Secondary Plan as is.

I have been involved in the Markville Secondary Plan and I already mentioned earlier that Markham will exceed the population growth targets from the Province and York Region.

If the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan recommend a minimum density of 200 people and jobs per hectare, why is the MRMJ Secondary Plan approving double the densities in an area with little infrastructure to support this kind of an explosion growth?

Unfortunately, Markham is more supportive of developers instead of their own residents.

This winter I spent a lot of time in Amstelveen (suburb of Amsterdam with a population of 92,000) and I was able to bike/walk to shops, pharmacies and medical centres and I did not need a schedule to take transit, because their schedule is very frequent. Car free lifestyle is possible there.

True livable and sustainable communities can be realized without the densities proposed for Markham.

Markham is a City already, but where is the infrastructure?

Amstelveen has an excellent Active Transportation infrastructure! There is little AT infrastructure in the MRMJ area at the moment nor in the Markville area!

Please, build AT infrastructure away from car traffic and do not build Multi use paths. It is key to build "protected intersections" for AT in a dense area.

Please, add my letter to the 10.1 Communication as I am not able to attend the DSC meeting.

Thank you,

Elisabeth Tan

Markham resident



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

T 905.669.4055
KLMPLANNING.COM

File: P-3278

April 19, 2024

City of Markham
101 Town Centre Blvd.
Markham, ON L3R 9W3

Attention: Chair Jones and Members of Development Services Committee

**Re: Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan
City File PR 20 142832
April 23, 2024 Development Services Committee Meeting
Wismer Markham (Commercial) Developments Inc. c/o Metrus Properties**

Dear Chair Jones and Members of Development Services Committee,

On behalf of our client and owner of the lands, Wismer Markham (Commercial) Developments Inc. c/o Metrus Properties, we are pleased to provide you with our comments with the respect to the recommendation report scheduled for the April 23, 2024 Development Services Committee meeting as it particularly relates to the recommended approval of the Mount Joy Secondary Plan.

As noted in our previous correspondence dated August 25, 2021, September 30, 2022 and November 21, 2023, whose comments to date have not been taken into account, the proposed plan continues to show a significantly disproportionate amount of community uses (school and parks) on our client's landholdings. As we have continuously noted, it is our position these community uses should be evenly distributed throughout the community. In doing so, this will provide better access to all of the residents within the Secondary Plan Area and will serve the future residents in a more efficient manner.

We have also previously commented and requested that a policy within the Secondary Plan should require that a formal landowner's group be created and prior to development applications being approved by the City of Markham, that applicants obtain from the landowners group trustee confirmation they are a member in good standing. In doing so ensures each landowner is treated in a fair and equitable manner. Staff have noted in the policy where it encourages the creation of a landowner group but does not prescribe it, nor does it require a letter from the trustee that landowners are in good standing prior to receiving development approval. In our opinion this must be included in the Secondary Plan.

With respect to the existing commercial permissions on the subject lands, we would like to have those permissions grandfathered so that one storey retail/commercial development can still occur on the subject lands without requiring an amendment to the Secondary Plan.

Lastly, we are encouraged by Section 7.1.4 of the plan that provides direction to reduce the parking rates within the Secondary Plan area. This is a concern we raised early on, and we are encouraged to see this having been included.

In conclusion, many of our significant concerns that have been raised numerous times have not been addressed in the latest version of the Mount Joy Secondary Plan. We respectfully request that prior to Council adoption, the above noted items be included in the version that will be sent to York Region for final approval. In addition, we continue to request notification of any decisions made by City of Markham and York Region Council's on this matter.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.



Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. David Drake – Metrus Properties
cc. City of Markham Clerks Office
cc. Lily-Ann D'Souza – Senior Planner, Policy Planning and Urban Design

From: Lucia Mariani

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 10:57 AM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <KRea@markham.ca>

Subject: Subject: Concerns Regarding MRMJ Secondary Plan Dear [Recipient], I am writing to express my strong opposition to the current MRMJ Secondary Plan, particularly concerning the excessively high density targets and the inadequate infrastructure provisions...

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

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the current MRMJ Secondary Plan, particularly concerning the excessively high density targets and the inadequate infrastructure provisions. As a resident of Peter St, I have witnessed firsthand the challenges posed by the congestion and lengthy commute times, especially during rush hours. The current plan exacerbates these issues rather than addressing them effectively.

First and foremost, the density targets outlined in the plan are unreasonably high, leading to increased strain on our already overburdened infrastructure. This not only results in longer commute times but also puts additional pressure on essential services and amenities, ultimately impacting the quality of life for residents.

Furthermore, I find it perplexing that the plan focuses solely on certain areas for development, while neglecting other potential locations like Markville Mall or downtown Markham. Distributing density more evenly across the city would not only alleviate the strain on existing infrastructure but also foster more balanced and sustainable growth.

It is evident that the current plan primarily serves the interests of developers, prioritizing profit over the well-being of residents. It is imperative that we reconsider this approach and explore alternative strategies that prioritize the needs of the community as a whole.

I urge you to reconsider the MRMJ Secondary Plan in its current form and work towards a more inclusive and sustainable development strategy that takes into account the concerns of residents and aims to create a livable and vibrant city for generations to come.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



LUCIA MARIANI • CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER

From: Thomas Tingchaleun

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 4:54 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Marcus Bowman; Rebecca Ramsey; Shaimaa Tantawy;

Subject: CITY INITIATED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE MARKHAM ROAD – MOUNT JOY
SECONDARY PLAN

Good afternoon,

On behalf of the Metrolinx's Development (Existing Stations) team, I would like to submit the following comment:

- If and when Metrolinx lands are redeveloped, coordination between Metrolinx and the City of Markham will be required to finalize the local road network depending on adjacent landowners' readiness to jointly establish Minor Collector 6 and Local Street 6 (which development on Metrolinx lands is reliant on for access to Bur Oak Avenue and Markham Road).

Thank you,

Thomas Tingchaleun

Development Coordinator, Development, Heavy Rail (Existing Stations)

Real Estate & Development

Metrolinx

Suite 200, 97 Front St West | Toronto | Ontario | M5J 1E6

C: 647.561.9350



-----Original Message-----

From: Sandy Koteles

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 8:50 AM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>

Subject: Density in the Markham road proposal

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 have lived in Markham for 43 years and have watched the community grow and change. While I agree that building housing around transit hubs makes perfect sense, the density numbers being proposed have significantly increased and in my opinion are way too high!

I wanted to agree with Karen Rea that the vision is good for the 16th to Major MacKenzie expansion however the density numbers are way too high!

Thanks

Sandy Koteles

Sent from my iPad

From: Siobhán Covington

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 1:05 PM

To: Councillor, Karen Rea - Markham <krea@markham.ca>; Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Subject: Mount Joy Markham Secondary Plan Apr. 23 meeting.

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.

Good Afternoon

I am in opposition to the Mount Joy Secondary Plan as it has been presented.

Concerns:

- Lack of a comprehensive traffic study for Markham Main Street, 16th Avenue & Major MacKenzie
 - How will traffic transition from 2 lanes into the planned calmed roadway below 16th Avenue without gridlock?
- Lack of details on the Public Parks – What are the total hectares committed for this purpose?
- Where is the environmental study on the planned reconfiguration of Mount Joy Creek?
- I strongly object to the intensification of the Mount Joy area while the City of Markham still lacks the fundamental infrastructure to facilitate the number of commuters or provide residents with a quality of life they should expect.

I fully support Councilor Karen Rea objections to this plan.

Regards,

Siobhán Covington
Old Markham Ratepayers Association
10 Peter Street

From: Francesco Fiorani

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 5:00 PM

To: Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>

Cc: Alligood, Erica <EAlligood@markham.ca>; Claudio Brutto; Julia Spagnuolo

Subject: RE: Notice - DSC - April 23rd, 2024 - 9:00AM - 3:00PM - 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)

Importance: High

Good Afternoon Clerks,

We have reviewed the DSC Recommendation Report for the April 23, 2024 DSC meeting as well as Appendix 1 – Comment Response Matrix and 2 – Draft OP Amendment attached herein.

Our response contained herein refers to the Subject Property located at 158 Anderson Avenue.

We believe that the revision to the building height illustrated on **Map SP3 – Height** of the Draft Official Plan Amendment is a step in the right direction on the City's behalf.

From our understanding, the building height on the majority of our client's property has been increased from 20 to 25 storeys. We further understand that there is an additional opportunity to increase both the density and height (by an additional 5-storeys on the "Mixed Use – High Rise" designation) without amendment to the Secondary Plan subject to meeting the criteria noted in policies 8.7.2 and 8.7.3 of the Secondary Plan. We believe this policy is helpful and provides flexibility to seek additional height and density as part of a future development application.

However, we continue to be concerned about the maximum 3-storey height along the site frontage on Anderson Avenue. This height in our opinion falls short in supporting adequate densities close to rapid transit facilities.

As such, we continue to refer to our previous Planning Justification Report from September 14th, 2023 which is attached to this email. This report asserts our formal position as it pertains to the latest version of the Secondary Plan.

Please confirm receipt of our email correspondence.

Regards,

Francesco Fiorani, B.U.R.PI

Senior Planner / Project Manager