



ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION STUDY

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED
NOVEMBER 2008 – MAY 2009**

- Part A: December 16, 2008 Focus Discussions (F numbering)
- Part B: Site Specific Comments (S numbering)
- Part C: General Comments (G numbering)
- Part D: Agricultural Comments (A numbering)
- Part E: April 24, 2009 Focus Discussions (F numbering)
- Part F: Site Specific Comments (S numbering)

PART A

December 16, 2008 Focus Discussions

On December 16, 2008, the Town hosted a day long session of one-on-one focus group discussions to allow landowners and stakeholders an opportunity to provide direct input into the Town's study. Where the stakeholders followed up with letters, the Town response is cross-referenced to Part B, C or D depending on the nature of the comment. Part A is a summary of the discussions.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Person/Organization	Input Received
F1	Mai Somermma Tom Hilditch Emery Investments	Cross Reference S21.
F2	Dave Farrow Tom Hilditch Trinison	Cross Reference S7.
F3	Ted Nickerson Don Givens Dave Farrow Mia Somermaa Rick Mangotich Tom Hilditch North Markham Landowners Group	Cross Reference S22.
F4	Randy Peddigrew Joanne Lane Remington – Parkview Golf Course	Cross Reference S15
F5	Jim Robb Colin O'Neal Friends of the Rouge Watershed	Need to address water quality issues. Need to improve water quality in urban area before moving forward with development in the rural area. Need to meet provincial water quality objectives. NHN bias in eastern Markham. Link archaeology to NHN.
F6	Tony Liebel Alan Liebel Dave deSylva East West Corridor	Cross Reference S13.
F7	Bob Clay Rouge Park	General support for NHN. Agricultural lands in Rouge Plans should be reflected in rural countryside. Eastern Markham lands will be primarily agriculture. Agriculture should be clearly permitted in NHN.
F8	Brian Reynolds Frank and Mike Whittamore Terry O'Conner	Cross reference A1, A8, A11, A14. Agriculture should be described as natural features. Do not identify NHN land in eastern Markham until Rouge Park

	Kim Empringham York Federation of Agriculture	study is completed. EIS study requirements onerous on farmers.
F9	Chris Gartner Norman Hibbert Don Goundry Lot 24, Con.6	Cross Reference S9.
F10	Tupper Wheatley Shelly Bourne Milne Conservation Area Association	General support for NHN. Milne Park needs a Master Plan.
F12	Michael Montgomery Joanne Lane Angus Glen	Cross Reference S16.
F12	Julie Bottos Joanne Lane Times Development	Cross reference S2.

PART B

Site Specific Comments

Part B contains the comments received from landowners and developers which are property or issue specific. Two general themes emerged from the responses and these are summarized in subsections a) and b) below. Other comments are noted on the table.

a) Issue: A number of responses were received from landowners within the urban area expressing concern over the Natural Heritage Network boundary extending on development lands with designations and zoning secured through approved Secondary Plans, Plans of Subdivision, Site Plans and zoning.

Response: The Natural Heritage Network comprises in part flood plain and terrestrial features mapping provided by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. The flood plain mapping provided by the TRCA was the original Rouge watershed mapping which did not include modifications to the flood plain mapping undertaken through detailed study and review in support of development applications. For the purpose of delineating the Natural Heritage Network in the urban area, the Natural Heritage Network now reflects the decisions of the TRCA and Town through the Secondary Plan, Plans of Subdivision and Site Plan processes. Where existing vegetation is not captured in the Natural Heritage Network, Tree Preservation Studies and the authority under the Tree By-law will be used to manage the resource.

b) Issue: The east-west linkages were the subject of a number of comments and many suggestions were provided on how to address the study objectives for east-west connectivity in the context of Markham's landscape.

Response: One proposed east-west linkage was identified to connect the Little Rouge Creek to Bruce Creek approximately halfway between Major MacKenzie Drive and Elgin Mills Road, utilizing the existing wetland features located between Highway 48 and McCowan Road and McCowan Road and Kennedy Road. It was recognized at the outset that there were alternatives to achieving this linkage and the comments regarding this location and rationale provided by the landowners and their consultants has lead to further detailed review of the east-west linkage proposals.

The consultant team have reviewed the proposal and have concluded that an east-west connection that links the upper reaches of the several tributaries in the north of Markham is an important requirement to meet the biodiversity objectives and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt policies for external connections, Region of York policies for connected and enhanced systems and current ecological and scientific principles for sustainable ecological systems. This connection can be achieved in two areas. As part of additional review, the consultants have identified that the connectivity objective can be met by focusing on a northern option that aligns with the existing tributary of the Little Rouge Creek running east west between McCowan Road and Kennedy Road connecting to Bruce Creek. This location takes advantage of the existing watercourse and is consistent with the TRCA terrestrial target mapping. It will be necessary to widen the existing linkage to achieve an ecologically functional connection. The ecological connections will be shown conceptually to allow the details of the corridor widths and locations to be determined through the preparation of Environmental Management Plans and other high level planning studies. Criteria for the ecological corridor will be developed and incorporated into the proposed draft policies.

Although the main linkage is now proposed through this northern option, it is still beneficial to maintain existing linkage functions between the Little Rouge Creek and the provincially significant wetland component connecting the Greenbelt finger north of Major Mackenzie Drive. Without such linkage, the PSW will be isolated and in all likelihood, eventually surrounded by urban development. Such isolation coupled with the inevitable impacts of urbanization is expected to result in impacts to the PSW that can be at least partially mitigated through preservation of the existing linkage to the Little Rouge Creek

Although the southern location may not be required as the primary ecological connection if the northern option is found to be preferable, this

southern linkage should be pursued as a minor multi-use connection from Bruce Creek to the provincially significant wetland. This southern minor connection would primarily be a combined wildlife-pedestrian connection and could incorporate some urban land uses (schools, parks, stormwater management facilities). As it will have a high proportion of green space, it will provide some ecological benefits and would achieve multiple community and natural heritage benefits. Criteria for the multi-use corridor will be developed and incorporated into the proposed draft policies.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Location	Issue Raised	Town Comment
S1	Aryeh Construction 8293 & 8303 Warden Ave.	Natural Heritage Network extends on lands Commercial designation.	Natural Heritage Network boundary has been adjusted to reflect the policies of the Secondary Plan (floodplain and 10 metre buffer).
S2	Times Group SE Hwy 7 and Warden	Natural Heritage Network extends on lands Commercial designation.	Flaska Ditch confirmed not a watercourse by TRCA. Natural Heritage Network boundary has been adjusted to reflect the policies of the Secondary Plan (floodplain and 10 metre buffer).
S3	Camark Holdings Ltd. West of Hwy 48, north of Major Mackenzie Drive	Object to Natural Heritage Network. Land is flat and without features to justify inclusion in the NHN.	The property contains a number of existing features and policy layers including the Greenbelt Plan, significant woodlot, wetland, Rouge Park boundary, floodplain. The consultants have recommended that an east-west corridor connecting the Little Rouge to the Provincially Significant Wetland be retained. The specific location of this corridor would be determined through an Environmental Management Study. See b) noted above.
S4	Box Grove Landowners Group	Natural Heritage Network extends on lands confirmed for development through approved and registered Draft Plans with a Commercial designation.	Natural Heritage Network boundary has been adjusted to reflect the Draft Plan approvals.
S5	Hwy 404 North Landowners Group	Natural Heritage Network extends on lands with an approved Industrial designation.	Natural Heritage Network boundary has been adjusted to reflect the policies of the Secondary Plan (policies direct the application of the Rouge Park boundary criteria). Where transition rights in the Greenbelt Plan apply they will be addressed through policy. The Town cannot modify the outer Greenbelt Plan boundary as identified by the Province.
S6	1696913 Ontario Inc. and Clera Holdings Limited Elgin Mills Road, west of Woodbine	Natural Heritage Network extends on lands with an approved Draft Plan.	Natural Heritage Network boundary has been adjusted to reflect the Draft Plan approval.

S7	Trinison Management Corp. North of Major Mackenzie, west of Markham Road	Request that Greenbelt lands be identified with a special policy to permit development if supported by Province through Greenbelt 10 year review.	Staff have no basis or authority at this time to recommend removal of Greenbelt lands even if the features on the land are questionable. The Provincial 10 year review is the appropriate vehicle to request that the designation be re-assessed.
S8	404/19 th Avenue Developments Ltd.	Greenway system should exclude ORM and Greenbelt on clients lands.	The ORM boundary will be identified as a separate layer on the Greenway System map and the policies of OPA 117 retained. Where transition rights in the Greenbelt Plan apply they will be addressed through policy. The Town cannot modify the outer Greenbelt Plan boundary as identified by the Province. The Town does not have the authority to revise the Greenbelt boundary. Should the applicant wish to peruse an ORM adjustment, the remaining ORM lands would be subject to the Greenbelt Plan in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan policies.
S9	Navona Investment Services Limited Kennedy Road and Major MacKenzie Drive	Want assurance that Town's NHN will not be more restrictive than Greenbelt Plan. East west corridor affects value of land even though located north of property. Propose alternative corridor location further north given existing features.	The Natural Heritage Network is intended for natural heritage protection. Existing and appropriate uses will be permitted to continue in the components of the Greenbelt not encumbered by natural features or other policy areas. The policy framework identifies the intended land uses. Noted above b).
S10	Romandale Farms Elgin Mills Road between Kennedy and Warden	Lands identified include plantations and lands under active cultivation. Some sites have no scientific rationale for inclusion in the NHN. More detailed comments to follow.	Objection noted. The Town will review any further detailed comments once received. A site visit is recommended for the property.
S11	Humboldt Properties Limited Greensborough Secondary Plan	Subject lands form part of Greensborough Secondary Plan and predate the Greenbelt Plan. Transition policies apply.	The proposed NHN has been adjusted to align with the Greenbelt Plan boundary and floodplain plus 10 metres (where it extends beyond the Greenbelt Plan area). Policies will be included to address the transitioned Secondary Plan permissions.
S12	Major Mackenzie Drive and NE Donald Cousens Greensborough Secondary Plan Area	Subject lands form part of Greensborough Secondary Plan and predate the Greenbelt Plan. Transition policies apply.	The proposed NHN will align with the Greenbelt Plan boundary and floodplain (where it extends beyond the Greenbelt Plan area). Policies will be included to address the transitioned Secondary Plan permissions.

S13	Minotar Holdings, Corlots Development and Cherokee Holdings Inc. East of Kennedy Road and north of Major Mackenzie	Opposed to the east-west enhancement corridor located on the subject lands. Request Figures 4 and 5 from the report.	The consultants are reviewing options for the east west corridor. See b) above. Provided.
S14	Kennedy Elgin Developments Fieldgate	Boundary on the property is inconsistent with OPA No. 140 settlement agreement.	The consultants have reviewed the property and adjusted the boundary to reflect the Rouge Park boundary as approved. The management of the hedgerow on the property will be reviewed in the context of an Environmental Management Study
S15	Remington Group Parkview/Little Farm	West boundary of site to align with regulatory flood line. Between Ninth Line and east side of the Rouge boundary follow the regulatory flood line.	The west boundary of the site has been aligned with the Regional woodland feature as it extends beyond the flood line. The boundary along the east side of the watercourse is subject to Middle Reaches Rouge Park policies which have been applied in a preliminary manner to this parcel. The triangular parcel landlocked by the Rouge River, CPR and CNR rail line contain lands identified as Regional significant forest and continue to be supported for NHN and enhancement lands. These lands will be subject to the land securement policies.
S16	Angus Glen North and Angus Glen West Village	NHN extends onto lands with an approved Secondary Plan. Site I – Not valleylands Site 2 – 2 irrigation ponds should not be included. Site 3 – Woodlot features included in NHN are associated with gold hole and a plantation and should not be included in NHN. Site 4 – Rouge Park designation includes irrigation pond. Wooded area not included	NHN has been adjusted to reflect the approved Secondary Plan. Site I – This site is identified as TRCA flood plain, significant regional forest and Rouge Park boundary. The proposed NHN boundary is retained. Site 2 – Water features including stormwater management ponds associated with watercourses are included in the NHN. Site visit required to confirm pond status for NHN. Site 3 -The woodlot areas are existing and managed in the golf course use. There is no basis to remove the proposed designation from these features. These vegetation communities are designated ‘Significant Forest’ by the Region of York. As such, they qualify for inclusion in the NHN. Field verification with the Region of York may be required to confirm the status of these features as ‘Significant Forest’. Site 4 - The delineation of the Rouge Park boundary in relation to these features will be reviewed utilizing updated flood line mapping from the TRCA. Field verification may also be required.

		<p>Site 5- Question the designation of the lands connecting to the east-west corridor.</p> <p>Site 6 – Object to Greenbelt boundary</p>	<p>Site 5 - The NHN at this location has been adjusted to follow Greenbelt boundary. This general area is identified to accommodate a multiuse east-west connection. Noted b) above.</p> <p>Site 6 -Greenbelt boundary to be incorporated into NHN as mandated through the Greenbelt Act.</p>
S17	34 Main Street, Unionville	NHN proposed on subject property and subject to planning applications for a retirement project.	The subject property contains TRCA floodplain and woody vegetation associated with the floodplain. The NHN boundary is to be confirmed to reflect the floodplain boundary and the required 10 metre setback including associated vegetation. Given the issue of the quality of the woodlot, confirmation of the limit of development would be warranted. Site visit needed to confirm.
S18	Canadian Mar Thoma Church (19 th /Kennedy)	Land purchased for future Place of Worship and identified as NNH. Securement policies encourage public acquisition which is not supported by the landowner.	Subject lands are proposed as NHN due to watercourse, floodplain, wetlands and Rouge Park layers. Intensification of new development would be not be encouraged due to environmental constraints. Existing uses are permitted.
S19	Forest Bay Homes Villages of Fairtree	NHN boundaries to not align with draft plan approval	This particular draft plan is not yet approved and there is no Secondary Plan in place. The NHN boundary is generally consistent with the proposed draft plan. The NHN has been adjusted to accommodate an optional access route proposed by the applicant at Kirkam Drive.
S20	David Wang	NHN should not include the existing hydro station at Warden Avenue	It is not the intent to include the hydro station in the HNH. The NHN has been delineated to exclude the station.
S21	Emery Investments	<p>East lands appear to be widening past the Rouge Park boundary.</p> <p>West lands are incumbered by the Greenbelt Plan boundary. Need further discussion about uses and infrastructure in the Greenbelt.</p>	<p>The intent of the NHN at this location is to encompass the Rouge Park boundary and lengthen the feature to include the forest and meadowlands feature along the small stream feature. The boundary has been adjusted to reflect the Rouge Park boundary and the additional lands require further clarification.</p> <p>Site visit needed to confirm.</p> <p>The west boundary is aligned with the Greenbelt. The NHN has been removed from the hedgerow features as these features will be addressed through policy. The policies will address land uses and infrastructure.</p>
S22	Markham North Landowners Group	The urban landscape will diminish the potential for a viable east-west linkage.	Existing features are not a prerequisite for maintaining the present connectivity across the existing rural landscape. The NHN should be viewed as a landscape

		<p>Should look at east-west linkage opportunities in area of existing features.</p> <p>Protection of small streams will be a barrier to development Land securement needs to be fair and legal</p> <p>EPRC not balanced</p> <p>Systems approach is needed which would not necessitate identifying Regional Biodiversity Centres. Want more input into the policies.</p> <p>EPRC is premature.</p>	<p>level mitigation of anticipated impacts associated with urbanization. Noted above b).</p> <p>The small streams policies would require the evaluation of small streams features to determine their contribution to base flow and their feature function (wetland). Council has provided direction to ensure the small stream study guidelines are implemented as we move forward in new growth areas. Balance is achieved through the Growth Management Strategy underway which includes the consideration of the environmental policy recommendations. Relatively large natural features within the connected NHN are needed to maintain the long-term biodiversity of the Town of Markham. Although final boundaries can be refined through detailed studies, these relatively large areas should remain a component of the NHN. Once Town staff have completed the preliminary review of the mapping products, further review and consultation will commence with the respect to the implementation policies. Staff do not agree that this study is premature. Council has authorized this study to ensure that the Growth Management Strategy builds on the protection of a Town-wide natural heritage system and that all Provincial policies are addressed.</p>
S23	Schickendanz Farm Warden and Major Mackenzie Drive	<p>Existing swale extending from Berczy Creek should not be reconsidered as part of the NHN. Any extension of the Greenbelt Plan area be subject to further vegetation and hydrological investigations.</p> <p>Drainage swale of north-east of the site needs to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>The existing drainage feature was identified as a “Watercourse” based on the map layer that was provided by the TRCA. There is no floodplain associated with the feature. A portion of this feature is captured within the valley corridor/Rouge Park associated with Berczy Creek. A site visit is recommended to confirm the feature. It is noted that because the Greenbelt boundary is not defined by features specifically and sometimes represents a “squared-off” interpretation of the corridors, there will be areas where the NHN line will exceed the Greenbelt boundary. The map layers previously showed this feature as a “watercourse” although it is discontinuous and ill-defined in some</p>

			<p>sections. There was a “valleyland” designation previously attributed to the feature as well. These 2 factors triggered the application of the RNMP criteria which in turn resulted in the delineation of the corridor. The recent mapping provided by TRCA does not attribute a floodplain to the feature and therefore if it is not a defined watercourse, it should not be included. The Natural Heritage Network layer on the swale has been removed.</p>
--	--	--	---

PART C

General Comments

Part C contains the comments received from stakeholders which are general issues. One re-occurring theme is the issues of meeting agency targets. Natural Heritage targets are a tool used by most agencies and municipalities to measure how natural heritage enhancement objectives are being met. The interpretation of natural heritage targets is often misrepresented and misunderstood. For example, the TRCA 30% terrestrial natural heritage target is jurisdiction wide and assumes a lower target for the southern urban municipalities and a higher target for the northern rural municipalities to reach the overall target for the jurisdiction.

The TRCA terrestrial natural heritage target for Markham is 20.38%, Toronto 13.9%, Caledon 39.45% and Whitchurch-Stouffville 41.10%. The same principle applies for the Region of York targets which assumes higher targets for the northern municipalities and lower targets for the urban municipalities to average the 25% region-wide.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Person/Organization	Issue/s Raised	Town Comment
G1	Jim Robb – Friends of the Rouge Watershed (June 2007)	Need to significantly increase forest and wetland cover to match TRCA NHS target of 30% for Rouge Watershed. See also F5.	The NHN proposed a target for Markham of 25%. This is consistent with or greater than Regional and TRCA targets for Markham and exceeds the targets introduced through the 1993 Natural Features Study.
G2	Peter Ross (June 2007)	Secure & Create public gateway to Rouge Park at the Northern section of Markham. Enhance valleylands Recreational uses should be secondary to preservation and enhancement. Guiding principles read more like the scope of the project.	Recommendations to be forwarded to the Rouge Park for consideration. Town staff and consultants will review the merits of the recommendations made for possible inclusion in the final draft of the report.

PART D

Agricultural Comments

Part C contains the comments received from stakeholders specific to agricultural issues. Seven major themes were identified which are discussed in more detail below.

- a) **Issue:** Non significant portrayal of agriculture.
Response: Agriculture is a significant cultural element in Markham's history. The report identifies the settlement patterns in Markham and the establishment of the agricultural sector in the 1800's. Staff /consultants will review the wording to ensure the information is reflected accurately.
- b) **Issue:** All affected stakeholders should be personally notified.
Response: The EPRC is a Town-wide study. Town-wide studies are communicated to the public through the local newspaper, website and mail and email for individuals or groups specifically requesting notification. This study was advertised in the Economist and Sun on November 27, 2008 and December 4, 2008. The notice was posted on the website and a copy of the public information notice was sent to all community associations and special interest groups. An individual circulation list is updated as

information is received and all individuals providing the Town with input and contact information will be notified of future meetings.

- c) Issue:** Changing the designation from Prime Agricultural to Natural Heritage Network will limit permitted uses and impair farm profitability.
- Response:** The Natural Heritage Network is intended to accommodate natural heritage features (woodlots, wetlands, valleylands), associated buffers and enhancement lands where identified by the consultant team to support biodiversity and TRCA terrestrial objectives. For the most part, these lands are already regulated and protected through various means, including TRCA flood plain regulations and ESA designations, Provincial ORM and Greenbelt Plans, classification of wetlands and ANSI's, Regional and local Hazard Lands and Environmental Protection Area designations and policies. Within the Natural Heritage Network, lands not forming part of a natural heritage or hydrologic feature or buffer, may continue to be used for agricultural purposes. The policies will identify existing agricultural uses as permitted in the Natural Heritage Network.
- d) Issue:** Added cost and expense of Environmental Impact Studies is not warranted
- Response:** The Environmental Impact Study requirement is a tool used by municipalities to assess a potential impact to a natural heritage or hydrological feature as a result of development. The Town's Official Plan already identifies this requirement and it is also a requirement in both the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. New farm infrastructure, such as tile drains or barns, would only be subject to an EIS if the proposed infrastructure would remove or impact existing natural heritage features or be located within the defined buffer areas.
- e) Issue:** The requirement for agricultural related uses, agri-tourism and farm sales outlets being tied to existing agricultural uses would prohibit new and innovative farm businesses.
- Response:** The proposed policies would not prohibit a current farming operation from changing the type of operation provided it continued to fall into the category of agriculture (not commercial or industrial). Staff will review the wording further to ensure clarity with this policy.
- f) Issue:** Local Food production promotes human health therefore there is no conflict with Provincial plans.
- Response:** The conflict provisions in the Growth Plan provide that where there are conflicts with the Growth Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement, the direction that provides more protection to the natural environment or human health would prevail. Should there be a conflict situation involving agricultural land, the Town would interpret the conflict with the assistance of the Province.

g) Issue: Reclassification of Prime Agricultural to Rural Countryside is not **minor**, but rather a **major** reclassification and counterproductive to the designation.

Response: The objectives of the Town are to implement an agricultural designation that supports the near urban agricultural challenges and opportunities and supports the objectives of the Rouge Park. While the rural classification would provide much more flexibility for agricultural, agricultural-related and Rouge Park uses, the Town has engaged in discussions with the Province and is satisfied that ‘prime’ classification could be retained with specific policies to address the issues related to the implementation of the Rouge Park.

The designation and policies have been revised to reflect a ‘Greenbelt Agriculture’ designation with the retention of the ‘prime’ classification in the Official Plan. The policies will identify the permitted uses and added flexibility to support the Rouge Park.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Location	Issue Raised	Town Comment
A1	B. Reynolds York Federation of Agriculture	Noted Above a, b, c, d, f, g Coordination with Agricultural Study. Add more descriptions under permitted uses for Agriculture. Rural design criteria for cluster building would prohibit farm road side stands.	Being done. Agricultural consultant asked to provide input on recommendations. We will review the wording and clarify through the proposed policies. This is not the intent and will be clarified.
A2	N. Cepriaso	Noted above b, d, e, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A3	Terry Reesor	Noted above b, c, d, e, f, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A4	Paul Reesor	Noted above b, c, d, e, f, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A5	Jeff Steiner	Noted above b, c, d, e, f, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A6	Harry & Murray Lewis	Noted above b, c, d, e, f, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A7	Don & Joyce Miller	Noted above b, c, d, e, f, g.	See response to issues raised above.
A8	Dr. Terence O’Connor Sec/Tres. York Cattlemen Assoc.	Noted above b, c, d, f, g. Will impact negatively on food production.	See response to issues raised above. Will review wording and clarify as that is not the intent.
A9	Jay Reesor	Noted above g. Concerned about the threat to agriculture in Markham from development activities in general. Federal land should be dedicated solely for agriculture.	See response to issues raised above. Town’s Growth management Strategy is intended to manage development in accordance with the Growth Plan. The Town will apply the Greenbelt policies to the Federal lands, however, the Federal Government is not subject to Provincial or Municipal legislation.

A10	Laurie Stollery	Noted above b, c, d. Disproportionate concentration of Green Space. No Concession to farmers for NHN securement. Restriction on farm Severance.	See response to issues raised above. This is a reflection of the location of natural heritage features and the Greenbelt Plan boundaries rather than a deliberate configuration. Land securement policies will form part of the future implementation Official Plan Amendment. Limited severance would be permitted in accordance with Town and Greenbelt policies.
A11	Mike Whittamore	Noted above a, b, c, d, e, f, g. No reference to Agriculture or food production in the goals of the Town-wide Greenway System. More needs to be stated on Public (Federal & Municipal landownership) as well as the creation of the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve. Biodiversity core areas likely to occur at the expense of agricultural lands and should be more accurately delineated. Agriculture is more prominently referred to in the Greenbelt Plan than in the EPRC report.	See response to issues raised above Agricultural goal will be addressed. The Official Plan policies are related to land use and not land ownership. The Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve was a Provincial initiative that does not extent into Markham. However, the text will be modified to acknowledge the context of Markham in relation to the existing Agricultural Preserve in Pickering. The Agricultural requirements will be addressed in the Final Report in accordance with the Greenbelt requirements.
A12	Denis O'Connor	Noted above g.	See response to issue/s raised above.
A13	Bernadette Manning	Noted above g.	See response to issue/s raised above.
A14	Kim & Murray Empringham	Noted above a, b, c, d, g. Other editorial comments.	See response to issues raised above. Staff/Consultants to address.
A15	Roger Steiner	Noted above g. Semantics of the language.	See response to issue/s raised above. Staff/Consultants to address.

PART E

April 24, 2009 Focus Discussions

On April 24, 2009 the Town hosted a day long session of one-on-one focus group discussions to allow landowners and stakeholders an opportunity to provide direct input into the Town's study. Part E is a summary of the discussions.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Person/Organization	Input Received
F13	Navona Investments Chris Gardner Norman Hibbert	Concern with wording used to describe the multi-use corridor. Seeking more clarity in the wording describing the corridor use. Cross Reference S27.
F14	North Markham Landowners Group Don Given Ted Nickerson Joanne Barnett Rick Mangotich	Concern with urban expansion requirement for an agreement before approval. More clarity needed around the Environmental Management study requirements. Land Securement Strategy should be advanced earlier rather than later. Cross Reference S28.
F15	Remington Lands Jo-anne Lane Randy Pettigrew	Question regarding the Regional Significant Woodland designation. Concern with the Natural Heritage Enhancement lands shown on the property. Site visit recommended to verify woodland. Cross Reference S33
F16	Angus Glen Michael Montgomery Joan Levy	Need to confirm water features including valleylands, floodplain and stormwater management ponds. Confirm woodlot feature – may be plantation. Site visit recommended. Cross Reference S34
F17	Romandale Farms Helen Roman-Barber Martin Mahoney Shaylagh McLaren Joan Levy	Need to confirm Regional Woodland designation. Land securement is an issue. Need to address flexibility for recreational uses Cross Reference S35
F18	Richard Arblaster 11142 McCowan Road	Staff provided information on the study background and natural heritage layers affecting the property. Cross Reference S24
F19	Humboldt Properties KLM Sandra Wiles	Discussion on transition requirements in the Greenbelt Plan. Not net loss policy discussed. Clarification regarding OPA 140 approval. Cross Reference S36
F20	Allen Liebel Clay Liebel Dave de Sylva	Concern regarding the identification of the east-west multi-use corridor. Concern over land being sterilized. Request that the designation be removed from the mapping and left for determination at Secondary Plan stage. Multi-use corridor is premature. Wording should include commercial and industrial uses. Cross Reference S37
F21	Markham Fairgrounds Julie Bottos Kim Empringham Candice Lee	Greenway limit is past the Greenbelt boundary. Town to confirm the boundary and adjustment if Greenbelt boundary extends 600 metres or beyond. Digital mapping provided for Lassiter subdivision, Boxgrove, 404 North and Times Markham Centre to address specific approvals. Cross reference S38
F22	North Markham Landowners	Seeking clarification on the multi-use activity linkage.

	<p>Group Ted Nickerson Tom Hilditch Heather Whitehouse May Luong William Mo Other Markham Landowners</p>	<p>Review of east-west corridor on the Trinison lands Discussion regarding review of the east-west corridor to look at options to support a reduced wildlife corridor and enhancing the wetland feature. Confirmation that final Greenway System line will be confirmed through detailed studies at the urban expansion and secondary plan stage. Cross reference S28</p>
F23	<p>Emery Investments Mai Somermaa</p>	<p>Need to confirm hedgerow and flood plain boundary on property at 9th Line Site visit recommended. Cross Reference S39</p>
F24	<p>Angus Glen West D. MacLaughlan Ted Nickerson Heather Whitehouse Tom Hilditch</p>	<p>Regional significant woodland requires on site confirmation. (Adjustment to mapping made following site visit. Site is heavily wooded with plantation material and Regional woodlands criteria should be confirmed with TRCA.)</p>
F25	<p>Schickendanz Julie Bottos</p>	<p>Question regarding the natural heritage bump-outs from the Greenbelt boundary. Site visit required regarding a swale – water feature. Cross reference S40</p>
F26	<p>Times Markham Rockport 34 Main Street Julie Bottos</p>	<p>Property subject to Markham Centre Secondary Plan and current site plan application. Julie to send map with delineated property boundaries. Times property flood plain delineation not accurately reflected in accordance with recent review. Cross Reference S30 and S41</p>
F27	<p>Don Miller Terry O'Connor Julie Bottos 11270 McCowan Road</p>	<p>Discussion regarding the flood plain boundary depicted on the property. Landowner suggests the flood plain boundary is not correct. Discussion regarding land securement and compensation for the ecological corridor.</p>

PART F

April 2009 – May 2009 Comments

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Ref.	Location	Issue Raised	Town Comment
S24	Richard Arblaster for AV Investments II Inc.	Objection to proposal. Request that study principles be re-examined. Town should not proceed unless objective information is provided.	The study purpose, goals and objectives and scientific and ecological justification has been identified in the background report.
S25	Albert VanVeldhuizen for Camark Holding Limited.	Objection to proposal. Land does not contain features that would justify a Natural heritage designation. Premature to move forward without comprehensive planning for the entire North Markham area.	Lands in the location identified are subject to the Provincial Greenbelt Plan. Comment noted.
S26	Brian Reynolds York Region Federation of Agriculture	Public access only on public lands. Need to address fair and equitable manner of dealing with lands encumbered by the natural heritage designation. Protect agricultural land uses within the Natural Heritage Network and enhancement areas. More description of agricultural uses. Re-examine property at 16 th and 9 th Line. Continue to support existing agricultural lands for farm uses.	Many of the points raised relate to ensuring the proposed policies clarify certain matters which will be reviewed at the detailed policy stage. The Town will be looking at policies to encourage a comprehensive approach toward natural heritage protection compensation through development agreements. All of Greenbelt eastern Markham lands will be reviewed in more detail in consultation with the stakeholders, Rouge Park and TRCA through the official plan process.
S27	Norman Hibbert for Novona Investments	Multi-use activity linkage not well defined in the policy document. Concern with wildlife access into urban community and conflicts. Confirm that setbacks are from the features and not the Greenbelt. Use less detailed and less precise mapping in the Official Plan.	Multi-use linkage clarified as an urban design feature and not included on Greenway System mapping. Buffers and setback are measured from features, not policy areas. The mapping reflects the features and policy areas as identified by senior governments and the TRCA. Refinements will be done to finalize the boundary at the urban expansion/secondary plan level of review.
S28	Don Given for North Markham Landowners Group	Land Securement Strategy needed to address fair and equitable approach to the dedication of lands.	Official Plan policies to detail land securement approach. Environmental Land Securement Fund available for environmental land purchases – Town to

		<p>Active parkland permitted in the NHS should be credited as parkland. Urban expansion requirement for NHN land dedication. Concerns with respect to policy approaches. No not agree with the scope and location of lands within the NHN. Suggested policy for ecological corridors. Do not support the technical rationale for the corridors.</p> <p>Town should use policy language rather than mapping to address biodiversity cores. Need to clarify the study requirements. Hedgerows need to be addressed on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Do not support ponds located 30 metres from edge of valley or stream. Disagree with buffer approach.</p> <p>Confirm Rouge North boundary will not include additional buffer. Small drainage features may not be able to be protected.</p> <p>Change wording of infrastructure policies.</p>	<p>review prioritizing lands contained in the Natural Heritage Network. Agree active parkland should be credited as parkland. Conveyance of Natural Heritage Network lands would proceed concurrent with associated development planning approvals. The NHN boundary is preliminary and will be confirmed through EMP's and EMSP's.</p> <p>The official plan policies will detail the criteria for corridors. Rationale will be contained in the final report. Both options have benefits – for the purpose of the study, the cores are shown symbolically. This will be done through the official plan process. Agreed. Stand alone hedgerows are not mapped and will be addressed through policy recognizing the need to address site conditions. This is a Greenbelt Plan requirement.</p> <p>Buffer policies will reflect Greenbelt requirement and Provincial and Town standards. Confirmed – Future Rouge Park boundary already incorporates buffer. Small drainage features will be assessed through Small Stream Study guidelines to determine a management approach. Wording will be confirmed through official plan process and will reflect Greenbelt requirements within the Greenbelt lands.</p>
S29	David Farrow MAM Group	<p>PPS refers to linkages between natural features not linkages between different watercourses as suggested by the Town.</p> <p>Rewrite policies to identify lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan are subject to the RNMP as guiding land planning and resource management documents. Need to clarify that the boundaries of the NHN will be finalized through further development studies.</p>	<p>The PPS speaks to linkage between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features and allows for a broad interpretation. The RNMP criteria has been applied consistently and fairly throughout the entire Town of Markham and approved by the OMB through OPA No. 140.</p> <p>This is the recommended approach and the Town will ensure that official plan amendment policies address this matter appropriately.</p>
S30	Times Development Markham Centre	<p>Applicant is requesting that the Natural Heritage Network be adjusted to the proposed limit of development proposed identified in the plan of subdivision application.</p>	<p>The Natural Heritage Network boundaries may be adjusted through development related studies approved by the Town. Once this application is draft plan approved by the Town and the TRCA conditions are</p>

			satisfied, the NHN may be adjusted to reflect Council approval.
S31	Highway 404 North OPA No. 149	Mapping should reflect approved and confirmed floodline. Re-confirm OPA No. 149 not subject to Greenbelt Plan.	Mapping adjustment has been made to reflect Rouge North (OPA 140) boundary. OPA 149 is subject to the Greenbelt transition policies. See comment S8.
S32	Box Grove Community	Adjust floodplain boundaries to reflect draft plan approvals.	Adjustment done.
S33	Remington Lands Steeles/Ninth Line	Application of the Rouge Park boundaries premature. Forest designation may not be accurately identified. Rationalize requested for enhancement area.	Rouge Park boundary has been applied as a preliminary boundary through OPA No. 140. It would be refined at the detailed study stage supporting a development application. Site visit confirmed a woodland vegetation community. This feature is identified as a TRCA significant woodland. If the feature is questioned, the applicant may assess the woodland with the TRCA to confirm its status. The proposed enhancement area was identified by the consulting team and TRCA given the locations (landlocked between the rail lines) and the proximity to the Rouge Park land south of the enhancement area. Further study is required at the detailed planning study stage to determine long-term protection, supportive land use options and or conveyance options.
S34	Angus Glen North Lands	TRCA valleyland designation to be confirmed. Pond should be removed from designation.	Adjustments to NHN made in accordance with removal of dated TRCA valleylands layer. West ponds removed (not contiguous with system), east ponds continue to be incorporated into the boundary through the Rouge Park boundary.
S35	Romandale Farms	Confirm role of recreational uses in the Greenway system. Confirm land securement process. Confirm Regional woodlands designation. NHN includes non feature lands.	NHN lands can support some nature-based recreational uses but are not generally intended for active recreation. Land securement policies to be included in the official plan policies. Site visit conducted and parties agree to confirm the regional woodlands criteria on the woodlot. The Greenbelt and Rouge North both include lands that do not contain features. These lands are buffer areas within the Rouge Park boundary and vegetation protection areas within the Greenbelt.
S36	Greenborough - Humbold	Mapping correction requested relative to approved plans.	Mapping adjustment made to reflect draft plan approvals and Greenbelt Plan area boundary.
S37	Minotar Allan Liebel Dave de Sylva	Confirmation of valleylands coverage.	Valleyland layer owned by the TRCA and predates the TRCA Generic Regulation. The valleyland layer is no longer a TRCA

			policy layer and has been removed.
S38	Markham Fair	Confirm the Natural Heritage Network boundary as it does not include any natural features.	The Greenbelt boundary has been confirmed..
S39	Emery Investments	Confirmation requested of Greenway boundary and drainage features.	Mapping adjustment have been made relative to a site visit. Features confirmed as hedgerows were removed form the mapping.
S40	Schickedanz Farm	Confirm swale feature identified a NHN. Confirm NHN bump out as it is not a feature.	Site visit confirmed swale is not a regulated watercourse and is removed from the NHN. This feature will be dealt with the Small Streams Guidelines. The bump out did not contain a features and was not associated with the Rouge North or Greenbelt boundary and has been removed from the mapping.
S41	Rockport – 34 Main Street - Markham Center	Property is subject to OPA 21 and is subject to a rezoning and site plan application for a retirement residence. The flood plain limit is being confirmed by the TRCA.	The mapping has been adjusted to address the TRCA approved limit of development and OPA No. 21 policies.