

January 15, 2013

Councilor Burke:

Thank you for the opportunity for our Residents Association to have input into the City's position regarding the OMB hearing requested by the developer of 7089 Yonge St., Thornhill. You have been extremely helpful to us over the past year in our dealings with this developer and, as usual, we appreciate your assistance.

In our meetings with the representative of the developer, it has become clear that he has relied on the contents of the Yonge Steeles Corridor Study, 2008, which was meant to be a precursor to a revised Thornhill Secondary Plan, which in turn was meant to be based, in part, on an updated, extensive traffic study of our area. As we explained in our meeting with the developer's representatives, the residents of Thornhill, and their respective residents associations, feel very strongly that these two documents must be in place before further development is allowed on Yonge Street in Thornhill.

We did not agree with all of the proposals made by the consultant who drafted the Yonge-Steeles Corridor Study, (which was just a study), but we were told that the community would have further input into the revised Thornhill Secondary Plan. In addition, we want to see the results of the City's comprehensive traffic study, which has not yet begun, but has been promised to Thornhill for several years. This is especially critical since we don't even know how the Liberty development will impact our residential area, let alone additional intensification along Yonge Street.

When this development first came to the Development Services Committee on October 25, 2011, the staff report contained the following statements:

"A comprehensive Secondary Plan for the Yonge Steeles Corridor is in preparation and will be presented to Council in the near future."

"Resolution of outstanding engineering issues, include...Transportation Analysis (Traffic Impact Study-including a traffic infiltration study for the surrounding neighbourhood.)"

We make note of the fact that the developer obtained a traffic infiltration study from Cole Engineering, which we have reviewed. We expressed our opinion to the developer that the Cole study was inadequate and made assertions about traffic infiltration that it had no evidence to support. For example, (1) the developer would put a traffic light at Yonge and Grandview, and yet Cole had not approached the Region to confirm that it would permit a traffic light at that intersection. (2) In order to reduce traffic

infiltration into our area they would not permit any right hand turns out of the development onto Grandview, and yet they had no answer regarding how the residents of the development would get out if they could not turn right, and if the Region would not permit a traffic light for their exit onto Yonge Street. The residents of the new development would be leaving for work in the morning with an enormous backlog of cars not able to turn right and not able, after turning left, to access the south bound lanes of Yonge. In other words, traffic gridlock before they had even left the property!

In any case, it is clear to us that developer funded traffic studies are no substitute for the City funded traffic study that has been promised, but is yet to materialize, for our area.

Due to the fact that neither an updated Thornhill Secondary Plan, nor a comprehensive traffic study yet exist, the community cannot support this new development on Yonge Street in Thornhill. We feel that to take any other position would be to contribute to poor urban planning which could, in turn, cause irreparable damage to our community.

We also make note of the fact that our residents association was in complete agreement with Regional Councilor Jones, who, at the meeting in April 2012, expressed his view that it represented poor urban planning practices to develop Yonge Street in this manner. He was interested, as are we, in seeing larger plots of land developed in a coherent manner, (i.e. a Plan), instead of this developer-driven, piece-by-piece, intensification that in no way resembles urban planning for one of the City's more important thoroughfares.

As has so often been the case in recent years, the residents of Thornhill feel that their needs are being overlooked by the City of Markham. We live in one of the areas of Markham designated for intensification and have stated repeatedly that we do not oppose intensification. What we do oppose is the fact that the City seems to be forging ahead with intensification with little concern for our community, which has existed for over 50 years.

We are good citizens, we are active in the life of our community, we contribute more than just taxes to the City, and yet the City is doing nothing to protect us from the potentially crushing effects of traffic infiltration and piecemeal planning.

We expect more from Markham, and feel that we have every right to do so.

Thank you again for your assistance,

**Ricardo Mashregi
Marilyn Ginsburg
Grandview Area Residents Association**