Soneji, Ishita

Subject:

FW: Section 37 Allocation Policy to GC

From: ricardo mashregi

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 12:08 PM

To: Kitteringham, Kimberley < KKitteringham@markham.ca>

Cc: Councillor, Valerie Burke - Markham < vburke@markham.ca >; Bezerra, Mylene < MBezerra@markham.ca >; Librecz,

Brenda < BLibrecz@markham.ca >

Subject: Section 37 Allocation Policy to GC

Hello Mr. Mayor and Members of the General Committee,

We are providing these comments, on behalf of the Grandview Area Residents Association (GARA) and Ward One South Thornhill Residents Inc. (WOSTRI), with respect to the staff policy report on the future use of Section 37 Allocation Policy (7.0). GARA and WOSTRI are the only Markham ratepayer associations with 5 years of direct experience actively involved in the planning process of using Section 37 funds.

For clarification, all \$2M of the s. 37 funds from World on Yonge is not going into Grandview Park. That is what the chart in the staff report says, which is not accurate. The steering committee (Chaired by Councillor Burke) from both communities chose to allocate \$46,000 to pay for phase 2 of the public realm art project at the CN underpass at Henderson/Proctor Avenue and \$30,000 for the playground equipment at E.J. Sands Public School.

These are our comments with respect to the suggestions in the staff report:

- 20% to City-Wide Public Realm Projects Good suggestion.
- 20% City-Wide projects already endorsed by Council in principle without an identified funding source (e.g. projects approved in the DC Background study or master plans that aren't fully fundable through Development Charges) – Good suggestion.
- 60% Projects within the planning area (+500M buffer zone) of where the Section 37 funds are collected.

Although the division of the s.37 funds proposed by staff seems fair, we do not think it is advisable to limit the use of 60% of the monies to locations within 500M buffer of the new development. That may work in a brand new subdivision or large development where there is still land available for parks and other amenities, but it might not work in a more established neighbourhood where there is no other available land.

If there is no available land within 500 meters of the property the City does not want to restrict the use of these funds to parkettes on the development property itself, that should be borne by the developer apart from Section 37 funds, as often these parcels are too small and the amenities are not well used. In this case the paramount use of the section 37 funds is for the needs of the existing community in established areas. We suggest a more practical approach. The use of 60% of the s.37 funds should be allocated ideally in the impacted area. On an exceptional basis, if no opportunities are available in the impacted area due to constraints other locations within the Ward boundary may be considered. This will provide more flexibility in where the funds are used while still serving the residents, new and existing. **Of course, in general, the closer**

the amenities are to the development project the better as that area will be directly impacted by the intensification development.

We believe that the local Ward Councillor should consult with the Commissioner of Community Services and local residents as residents are particularly in tune with the needs of their neighbourhood. This could be accomplished by a series of public meetings where local input is requested. The final decision of the use of section 37 funds is left to the local Ward Councillor. (But the final decision, as stated in the policy, is Markham Council's.)

It should be acknowledged that Councillor Burke and Commissioner Librecz were instrumental in the success of these projects.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide our perspective on this important issue.

Respectfully,

Ricardo Mashregi

Grandview Area Residents Association (GARA)

Evelin Ellison

Ward One South Thornhill Residents Inc. (WOSTRI)

