



MINUTES
UNIONVILLE SUB-COMMITTEE
August 27, 2013
Canada Room

Committee Members

Regional Councillor Jim Jones
Councillor Don Hamilton
Councillor Alan Ho

Staff

Richard Kendall, Development Manager – Central District
Sabrina Bordone, Planner II
Kitty Bavington, Council/Committee Coordinator

Applicant

Patrick Chan, Principal
Michael Morrissey, Architect
Peter Smith, Bousfields Inc.
David Johnston, Consultant

Residents

Roger Lambert
Donna Lambert
Neil Slater
Nicola Slater
Norma Kennedy
Peter Miasek
Harry Eaglesham
Brian Brewer
Gayle Leroux
Joanne Watt
Paul Marsh

The Unionville Sub-Committee convened at 7:05 p.m. with Councillor Don Hamilton in the Chair.

**Global Unionville Development Inc. (Sylmatt Investments Inc.)
Applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment
to Permit a High Density Residential Development
28 Main Street Unionville (OP/ZA 12 122739) (10.3, 10.5)**

On June 18, 2013, the Development Services Committee referred this matter to the Unionville Subcommittee and directed that community information meetings be held as necessary.

The Committee had the following for background information:

- Minutes of June 18, 2013 Public Meeting
- Staff Report dated May 21, 2013

1. Disclosure of Interest – none declared

2. Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone and the attendees were introduced.

3. Staff Overview

Sabrina Bordone gave a brief overview of the current applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments for the high-density proposal. Staff outlined the location, area context, road network, woodlot, and surrounding uses, and advised that the parcel is primarily vacant with the exception of some vegetation and an existing dwelling located at the east end of the site. The applicant has been working over the summer months to address comments and update the studies, and has been meeting with stakeholders on potential revisions to the plans. Currently, the west parcel (Building C) would be 27 stories with 334 units; the east parcel (Buildings A & B) would be 9 and 19 stories with 161 and 261 units respectively. Underground parking is proposed for both the east and west parcel, with the underground parking extending beneath the proposed park for the west parcel.

Staff and the applicant's representatives responded to questions regarding:

- the status of Bill Crothers Drive
- the FSI calculations for density and clarification with regards to the existing Official Plan standards for calculating the same
- the property boundaries were confirmed with respect to the proposed park and the rail line being the westerly boundary
- the traffic study is being updated

4. Applicant Presentation

Michael Morrissey gave a presentation of the original proposal, the issues identified, and the revisions to the plan to address the issues. Mr. Morrissey confirmed the FSI calculations equalling 3.95, and advised that the proposed development's density would support the mobility hub.

The applicant is attempting to create a joint presence and cohesive development with the surrounding sports high school, Pan Am facility, and Rockport development, with a potential central event space/plaza. Other improvements and highlights of the plan were noted:

- realign building wall with Enterprise Boulevard
- mid-block pedestrian parkette
- frame the high school with a park/plaza and point tower
- link pedestrian realm with event plaza in the Pan Am facility
- acquisition of the vacant Rockport lands to the north ("Parcel 3") for potential development phasing
- traffic will be distributed in as many directions as possible to reduce congestion
- building heights are comparable to surrounding buildings
- the building massing concept illustrates the point towers and stepping-up from Main Street to reduce the impact from the street
- 814 parking spaces on two levels below grade, plus 60 above for a total of 874 spaces are being provided
- a variety of unit sizes will be provided for a total of 774 units, which includes use of additional Rockport lands to the north (Parcel 3)
- some retail at grade will be provided for neighbourhood services and retail, possibly an office mix that serves the sports theme

5. Discussions

Concern was expressed for shadowing on the school, and transitioning the density to preserve the neighbourhood character as a gateway to Unionville and Main Street. It was noted that this area is part of Markham Centre and that the scale along Enterprise Boulevard will be higher than along Main Street.

Discussions included the height and density as contemplated in the (incomplete) Precinct Plan, and within the Markham Centre context as an urban growth centre within the existing larger policy framework for higher density. The standards will be further refined in the upcoming Mobility Hub study exercise.

Traffic congestion was discussed at length. Several suggestions for traffic improvements were made, including road connectivity with surrounding developments to provide greater neighbourhood integration. An option to open East Drive as an alternate access was not supported by the residents.

The consultants confirmed that the traffic counts had been taken during the school year; however, the recent signal timing changes may not have been taken into account, and this will be reviewed and updated. The Committee requested that the improvements to Birchmount Road and Sciberras Road, as well as impacts from the GO Station traffic, the number of cars taking students to the school, and where the cars are originating from (Birchmount, Warden, etc.) be added to the traffic equation.

The Transportation Impact Study has been reviewed and comments have been provided by staff. The applicant will respond to the comments and revise the study accordingly. The residents suggested that the potential totality of all the lands in the area be considered in the study, for combined impacts. Staff will provide a copy of the study to the residents for review.

6. Next Steps

Staff will continue to work with applicant on the submission of revised applications and will report to Development Services Committee. A further Public Meeting may be required. The applicant agreed to at least one more community meeting, if necessary.

Adjournment

The Unionville Sub-Committee adjourned at 9:05 p.m.