

**YONGE-STEELES WORKING GROUP
COMMENT SHEET SUMMARY
September 26, 2007**

The following is a summary of the feedback that was received from the Comment Sheets that were distributed at the September 26, 2007 Yonge-Steeles Working Group Meeting.

1. Do you agree with the proposed densities (i.e. 3.5 FSI at Yonge/Steeles, 2.0 FSI for block east of Dudley, 2.5 FSI for blocks along Yonge)?

- No – I believe the thinking is small town. Density must be higher for developers to afford the land and construction costs. Higher density is required to address subway opportunities, which ties into traffic congestion relief. Plus, with improved densities, higher tax revenues would follow, allowing for infrastructure improvement (sewers and roads).
- Yes – agree with densities proposed.
- Agreed.
- Yes.

2. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed setbacks on Yonge Street (i.e. 10 m build-to-line with retail at street level south of the railway and 15 m build-to-line with predominately residential uses north of the railway)?

Agree:

- Yes – agree with proposed densities as they support pedestrian/mass transit and greening initiatives.
- Agree – I hope this will be enough space to provide an area to eat outside.

Disagree:

- Disagree – the setbacks on Yonge Street north of the railway should also be 10 m.
- Disagree – the setback on Yonge Street north of the railway should also be 10 m, as this will allow better connection for pedestrians between Yonge Street and the building entrances and small shops.

3. Which demonstration plan do you prefer (i.e. linear open space with low built form, 3 parks with moderate built form, or 5 parks with high built form)?

- High built form with the opportunity to provide green spaces both along Yonge Street (at points) and Dudley Avenue.
- I prefer the linear open space with low built form (Option A).
- Prefer linear open space with low built form (Option A).
- I would like to see 3 parks with moderate built form (Option B).

4. Which traffic infiltration measures would you like to see implemented? Which ones do you dislike?

Like:

- Minimal stops signs, several speed humps, and one-way streets.
- Traffic circles at side street intersections and some controlled side street on-site parking to slow down traffic.
- Traffic circles.
- Traffic circles (North York: Clyde and Haddington, Richmond Hill: Jefferson Forest area). One-way streets (½ or full block/limited partial block). Revised curb extension. Roadway narrowing near intersections and at mid-block. Turn restrictions via signage.
- Anything that will slow down traffic.

Dislike:

- Thinning/narrowing of streets.
- Street closures, speed humps, one-way streets.
- Speed bumps.
- Speed humps and raised features (reasons: emergency vehicles, snow plowing, vehicle spring and suspension).
- I would not like to see on-street parking used as a mechanism to slow down traffic.

5. Do you support reduced parking standards and the provision of on-street parking in the redevelopment area?

- Reducing at-grade parking standards makes sense; however, parking should be pushed underground or into decks not visible from Yonge Street. This type of provision support higher density, as parking structures are expensive and the costs to recoup investment are offset with higher densities. On-street parking should be avoided unless traffic infiltration and calming measures allow for better flow.
- I support a 1.5 underground parking space ratio per condo-unit for use by residents, visitors and shop customers. I also support on-street parking in the redevelopment area.
- Ample underground parking should be provided for the condo units. A parking ratio of 1.75 parking spaces/unit is recommended.
- Yes, I support both a reduced parking standard and the provision of on-street parking in the redevelopment area.
- I agree with a reduced parking standard and on-street parking in the redevelopment area between Dudley Avenue and Yonge Street. Parking in the residential area should not be allowed unless sidewalks are available.

6. Should the Town restrict all redevelopment proposals in the study area until the Thornhill servicing study has been completed?

- Revenue from redevelopment should be earmarked to upgrade stormwater management. The Liberty development could kick-start this need.
- NO! The Thornhill servicing study should speed up and the development proposals should be processed at the same time, simultaneously. We want the study area to be transformed into an exciting and better community.
- No, this will cause unnecessary delays. The servicing study and the redevelopment can proceed together.
- Yes, to prevent precedent setting/grandfathering.
- If that can be done, then yes. Let's not let redevelopment get ahead of upgrades that will be required to support the redevelopment.

7. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add?

- I hope that the initial consultant's recommendations will be rejected as they are not considering balance with the business world. The density standards are not reasonable when one considers land costs. If there is a hidden agenda to slow development, this would work if it were not for the Liberty proposal. If the Liberty proposal was mine, I would move quickly for the OMB hearing to challenge the consultants. Having experienced this situation several times in the Yorkville district, the Liberty proposal will win. The presentation on October 3rd was a big let down and likely embarrassing if presented to Town Council. Markham continues to make impressive strides with developments within the Town Centre, why are we not interested in setting a world class planning position at such another important location that is a gateway to a world class city? The Thornhill neighbourhood is aging and there is terrific opportunity to regenerate Yonge Street. I believe one can have tall (well designed) buildings (condos, apartments and offices) together with open parks. My challenge to the consultants and Town Council is to deliver a balance for November.
- I have three additional comments that I would like to add:
 - I agree with 20-storey guideline for each condo tower with limit of tower footprint of 8,000 sq. ft. for each floor;
 - Enhance pedestrian access and good exposure from Yonge Street to the building entrances and ground floor shops north of Rail line;
 - Allow adequate 30 minute street-level parking inside the property line in front of street shops facing the side streets for use by shop customers. Otherwise, the street shops cannot survive.
- Parking should not be allowed on Yonge Street during peak hours.