

From: Elizabeth Janz

Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2024 3:58 PM

To: Bharadwaj, Anushrut; Clerks Public; Councillor, Keith Irish - Markham

Subject: Greenpark application Yonge street and royal orchard and Yonge Street redevelopment proposals

To Markham City Council

Please note I am not happy to find that the form is unavailable during weekends to be completed therefore I am submitting this request in this email to speak **virtually** at the meeting at the October 1 2024 meeting.

My petition:

I am very concerned with the dismissive nature that council is taking towards creating massive residential development that is incongruent with the existing nature of the community and not consistent with infill policies of the official plan. The proposed high rise developments and commercial development with its proposed heights between 60 to 80 stories (or more) lack any architectural, social or historical connection to the existing neighbourhood and the historic nature of the area and is incompatible as proposed for the area.

The city should be developing a plan that accentuates the historic nature of the area through in both its business and residential designs based on infilling principles. Any development within and adjacent to historic Thornhill should elevate and be aligned with the historic attractions of the community of old Thornhill. We are not downtown Toronto, New York, or Toyoko and are not the right place to have immense densities as proposed in the current descriptions of development. This type of development at these densities does not exist or even been approved anywhere within the GTA. Markham should not be the experiment since we can already see that continuous high rise development (at much lower densities than in the current proposals) north of Yonge and Finch has become a barren, wind tunnel. People use it strictly to drive down and walk to the subway. If there were under ground tunnels, I doubt we would see anyone walking along this corridor. Our planning staff should be ensuring public activity along Yonge street and highlighting old Thornhill are priority in development applications for the area.

As of today, the city has not met its obligations to ensure that the developments can even be serviced by sewage and water, much less accommodate pressure on roads, schools, fire, community services. While dense development is expected at the two main hubs to be located at Hwy 7 and Steeles avenue, development at those locations are being planned with more thought and a lower densities than all of the infills near old Thornhill.

I request all applications be held in abeyance until a detailed secondary is updated for the area that requires compatibility with historical preservation and infill policies for the area and that submission must be redesigned to enhance the historical nature of old Thornhill along the Yonge street corridor.

I also request the development approvals for the corridor be held in abeyance until the City ensures the below issues are also addressed

Any redevelopment and infilling within existing communities should be well planned and should include detailed plans prior to consideration of an amendment to ensure that the amendment and zoning are complimentary to and well planned with the existing communities, services and land use constraints prior to a proponent seeking approval of a generic increase in density and land use. How can we fully participate unless we can see and comment on the actual development to be established at the site. The developers are not interested in the community and appear to only be interested in maximizing density at heights unseen in the GTS today.

We see that the City is not providing a plan for the whole corridor but contrary to good planning practices is accepting individual site applications that amend the plan piece by piece. How can city council expect citizens to understand and make their comments known if the city has not provided the full plan for the area and what it thinks it should look like. This is undermining the planning process as it is impossible for any citizen to keep up with the number of proposals that seem to be underway. What is the City's vision? where do I get to see the whole picture? How is the city protecting the interests of the community in ward 1?

We support withdrawal of any proposed OPA and rezoning without detailed proposal, along with supporting environment, social and technical reports for the site's redevelopment to ensure redevelopment of the site can be understood by the community, what it will look like and what impact it will have on the community and services within the community. These are not "green field" locations but infills.

We formally request the below issues associated with site along the corridor be addressed as part of any proposed OP amendment and rezoning for redevelopment at along this corridor abutting old thornhill and also within/abutting existing low density residential development:

1) Markham has no buildings currently 60 stories in height. In Toronto's downtown core, only has about a dozen buildings with 60 stories or more - none within a single corridor along Yonge street. Toronto has located structures of this height in its core in a highly urbanized areas which Markham ward 1 is not. Markham ward 1 is abutting Yonge street and includes historic Thornhill. This area has a low rise residential character as was intended under the current OP and should remain. The redevelopment of the site should continue to protect the character of the community and old Thornhill.

2) World on Yonge is 31 stories and even at that height is not congruent with the area. It towers above the mixed uses within the area which is highly commercial, and industrialized with some residential. It is also significantly distanced from historic Thornhill. World on Yonge is located south of the train yard overpass - giving physical and visual separation between the existing low to mid rise development north of the bridge. World on Yonge has commercial development across from its location. It also has a large separation between its location and most of the low density housing located within its envelop (which is south of the bridge) whereas this proposed OP amendment

and rezoning will abut low to mid rise residential. 60 stories is clearly not reasonable change to the character of the area.

3) Can fire protection services to buildings of these heights without purchasing new equipment? What is the cost of providing fire services to buildings of this size?

4) Parking from the low to mid rise buildings already have taken up most of the street parking in the area. Unless you are thinking that the site can support 20 plus levels of underground parking for residential and commercial uses, how does the proponent propose to manage this pressure? What does the city propose to do to prevent parking pressures and possible interference with the water table in this area due to cumulative impacts of multiple underground parking structures along this corridor.

5) Traffic will increase along with safety concerns at the schools in closest proximity to yonge street. Has the child safety and increased traffic been accounted for by city council members?

6) Do we have enough school spaces to accommodate the pressures from the proposed residential increases? and what are the anticipated impacts to the congestion and traffic pressures to the community due to redevelopment of the yonge street corridor and what is the City's plan to deal with these pressures?

7) What are the cost of providing increased policing associated with commercial and residential increases under this proposal?

8) Park land proposals are small and not comprehensive as the city has not taken the time to prepare a comprehensive public space plan for the Yonge street corridor, ward 1, and the old Thornhill located in both Vaughn and Markham. What is council's plan to keep the liveable and walkable nature of the area and the community.

9) The City needs to develop a comprehensive proposal, focusing on the historical nature of the area using both natural environment, historical links to the area and high quality architecture, that promotes the area as both local pedestrian use but also attracts tourists and tourists businesses to the area.

10) The city also needs to advice on how community services be increased to accommodate residential needs given the increased populations associated with development along the whole corridor.

10) What impact will these multiple proposals have on water, waste and other municipal services? Will we see any delays and interruptions to critical services to the existing community on water, storm water management and sewage services?

11) How will all of this construction be managed so as not to adversely impact the community?

We ask the city prepare an updated secondary plan which includes responses and information on the above comments as a priority. The City should undertake an active and highly public review of an updated secondary seeking input on how the corridor is

being planned for by the City. It needs to include commitments to architectural standards that support Old Thornhill and the adjacent low density development which abuts the corridor as well as solid plan for a liveable and walkable community that we currently have in the area. Until an updated secondary plan with sound public engagement is completed, development along the corridor should either conform within the existing zoning at current density or held in abeyance until a detailed plan that we the community supports is in place.

Thank you

Elizabeth Janz and Ghasem Fani
28 Alcaine Court
Thornhill, Ontario
L3T 2G7