

GLENWAY LESSONS LEARNED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Why were no Town staff called as witnesses to support the Town's position at the OMB hearing?

Town staff did not play a role in reviewing the application and/or providing a professional planning opinion to Council. Council instead hired an outside planning consultant (Ms. Victor) to, in effect, act as staff on this application and to process the application and make recommendations to Council.

Council did not hire Ms. Victor to defend the Official Plan, but rather to process the application and provide a professional planning opinion and recommendations to Council.

Because staff did not play an active role in reviewing and/or processing the application (other than to provide administrative support to Ms. Victor), staff could not be called upon to provide evidence on the appropriateness of the application at the OMB.

In the event Council had not hired Ms. Victor and instead staff had made a specific recommendation to Council, staff's position at the OMB would have been in support of the staffs recommendations in their professional opinion, and not just to support Council's position. For example, in instances where Council does not agree with staff recommendations, it cannot then ask staff to defend Council's decision at the OMB and it must decide whether it wants to hire its own professional planner (as was the case here) to defend its position.

2. How can the Planner for the GPA come up with points and a strategy to challenge Marianneville's proposal and the Town did not?

At Council's direction following the referral of the plan to the OMB, Town staff contacted 10-12 planning consulting firms, both locally and from across the Region, in an effort to find a professional planner that could support Council's position. In addition to specific conversations with the firms, staff also provided background reports and Town planning documents for their review where requested.

Upon reviewing the application and the available documents, only one of the planning consulting firms was able to support Council's position.

Although the GPA was able to find a planner to support Council's position, the OMB was not swayed by that professional's evidence and instead preferred the argument and evidence of

the developer's consulting planner and that of Ms. Victor who appeared at the OMB Hearing for this Phase under subpoena by the developer.

3. The OMB adjudicator suggested the fact the Town didn't attempt to purchase the Glenway lands demonstrated their lack of interest to protect it from development. We hear that the Town did consider purchasing Glenway in some manner years ago. What is the story?

Council did have discussions regarding the purchase of Glenway Golf Course however, these discussion took place in closed session and as such, are not publicly available at this time.

4. The GO Bus Terminal location was a key reason for the OMB to support development as it was described as a major transit hub. As part of the Town's Secondary Growth Plan we see discussion of revamping transit to better support intensification including co-locating transit with GO Bus/Train to East Gwillimbury to promote much greater usage of transit. Why wasn't this part of the Town's defense?

During the development of the Secondary Plan staff met with Metrolinx to discuss the future of the GO bus station and in particular whether Metrolinx had any plans to redevelop the property and relocate the buses elsewhere (e.g. either on to the mall property or the GO Station in East Gwillimbury, or any other location). Staff was not advocating for the GO Station to move, but rather was trying to understand what plans, if any, Metrolinx had for the GO Station. Metrolinx advised that they had no plans at the time to move the GO station from its current location.

At the same time, staff was working with the Upper Canada Mall in terms of its future development plans. It was determined that as part of any master plan for the Upper Canada Mall, the Town, Region, and Metrolinx should at least explore the appropriateness of integrating transit into the mall site, be it YRT, VIVA, and/or GO, and policies reflecting this have been included in the Secondary Plan. As noted, this does not mean that the GO Station is closing or moving, and no decision has been made to move the GO station at this time.

5. When did (a) the Mayor and (b) the Director of Planning, Rick Nethery, learn that Ruth Victor was minded to recommend allowing development on the Glenway lands?

Generally, Ms. Victor's position was made known through the submission of Planning Reports to Council. Ms. Victor submitted Report 2013-47 in October 2013 which indicated that there were a number of outstanding issues and development on the site as proposed could not be supported. In November 2013, Ms. Victor prepared a memorandum to Council providing responses to a number of questions raised by the public at the October 15, 2013 Committee meeting including indicating that there was not a planning basis to recommend a no growth option.

6. Did the Director of Planning ever consider that the September 2013 Transportation Study (prepared for the Town by external consultants GHD) might be relevant to the March 2014 OMB Hearing?

As a requirement of application submission, a Traffic Impact Study was submitted by the developer and prepared by Cole Engineering. Ongoing review of the Traffic Impact Study was provided by the Town's checking consultants (RJ Burnside), utilizing experts in transportation engineering. It is these experts that review the material to ensure all relevant information is included. While the traffic work associated with the Marianneville Development has not specifically cited the GHD reports, it has taken into consideration future traffic impacts of development in the area including the urban centres.

Furthermore, there is a condition of draft plan approval that requires the owner to submit a Traffic Impact Study and Traffic Functional Design report to the satisfaction of the Town and Region of York. The reports will address the internal and external traffic implications of this development, including but not limited to the functional classification and design of roadways proposed within this draft plan of subdivision and confirmation that the proposed road configuration can safely provide for vehicular, transit and pedestrian traffic. The reports will identify any external road improvements required for this subdivision, make recommendations for sidewalk locations, on-street parking locations and prohibitions, and provide an analysis of sight distances and stopping distances. In addition the reports shall address all outstanding comments provided by the Town's Consulting Engineer as part of the Draft Plan review process.

7. Did the Director of Planning share the views of Ruth Victor on the development of Glenway?(This was asserted by Marianneville's Ira Kagan in his concluding remarks at the OMB Hearing.)

These discussions with the Director of Planning took place in closed session and as such, are not publicly available at this time.

8. Why was the study area of the Anchor Mobility Hub at Young and Davis not shown on the Schedules to the Secondary Plan, as requested by Metrolinx?

Through discussions with Metrolinx and the Region, it was determined that a Mobility Hub Station Area Plan would be identified around the Newmarket GO train station given the complexity of this area in terms of opportunities and constraints to development related to the floodplain, access and mobility issues related to the GO station including the potential for future grade separation, etc.

While the Yonge/Davis area is also identified as a mobility hub, it was determined that a full mobility hub study or station area study was not required and many of the issues around

access, land use, integration of transit, etc., could be addressed through the future Master Plan for the Regional Shopping Centre Study Area in consultation with Metrolinx, the Region, and the Upper Canada Mall. Therefore, while a formal mobility hub study was not shown, similar components of such a study will be part of the aforementioned Master Plan Shopping Centre study.

9. When did the Director of Planning form the view that the two Mobility Hub studies would consider, as part of their remit, the possible co-location of the GO Bus Terminal and GO Rail Station?

The future of both the GO train and bus stations was an ongoing consideration throughout the development of the Secondary Plan. These discussions included land owners, Metrolinx, York Region, and the Town's Planning Consultants. No specific decisions were made about co-location, etc., however it was acknowledged that future studies should be carried out (in the form of a Station Area Plan in one instance and the Regional Shopping Centre Study Area Plan in the other) that would evaluate the appropriateness of this and many other issues.

Questions from the Public Information Session

10. Construction Management plan: Is it finalized? Where and how will community input be considered? What are the approved hours of work? Street-cleaning and effective dust control: apart from dust-control barriers on our existing fences, this does not seem to be addressed in any detail.

The construction management plan is not yet finalized. The final document will identify the prohibited hours of work (typically in line with the Town's Noise By-law 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. on weekdays and 8:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays).

Street cleaning will be completed on an as needed basis which, depending on the conditions, could range from not being required at all to multiple times a day.

In addition to the siltation control and construction fencing that will be installed around the perimeter of the entire site, any areas that are left with open dirt, including top soil stockpiles, can be over seeded to keep dust down. It should be noted that despite dust control measures, in an active construction site, dust infiltrating into neighbouring properties will be inevitable, however every effort will be taken to minimize the impact.

A construction liaison committee has been formed and will be useful in mitigating impacts as well as expressing community concerns.

11. By-laws and by-law enforcement: How will the by-laws be reinforced and what will be our direct dial contact numbers to report infractions, including outside of normal working hours? What are the penalties for infractions and will there be a sliding scale for continued infractions? How will the Town ensure a rapid response to calls from the community? A separate email on this topic has been sent to our Ward Councillor.

The construction management plan will be updated to include contact information for the Town's working hours and after hours complaint numbers. Fines for noise by-law infractions are under the Provincial Offences Act. If charges are laid through the court system, fines are determined by the Justice of the Peace at the time of conviction.

The Town also holds securities against performance conditions as part of the subdivision and site plan agreements as applicable.

12. Tree relocation: Will some trees be relocated to take account of lost trees for existing residents? What process and approach will the Dir. of Planning be using to determine tree replanting location/tree type etc.? Can some mature trees be relocated into the back yards of new single unit houses to mitigate the loss of viewscape and green space for existing residents?

The Town has a Tree Preservation, Protection, Replacement and Enhancement Policy that the developer is required to adhere to. Where possible, trees will be relocated. The areas that may see the relocation of trees are the new rear yards of new lots as well as within the condominium blocks. The Town utilizes an arborist to assist in reviewing and approving relocation techniques as well as new locations for trees along with the Town's Capital Projects Parks Development Coordinator. The compatibility interface plan indicates that where there are no existing trees in adjacent existing back yards, new trees will be planted in the rear yard of the new lot to assist in addressing compatibility.

13. Timing of work on the site (phases). It is my view that no work should be allowed prior to the approval of services by the Town. Approving earth moving early in the process and prior to Phase approvals will leave the entire community looking at dirt piles for the full length of the building period (years?). The developer claims that this would be more 'efficient' for them - I would ask that some more consideration be made for the residents.

The current proposal, which is consistent with the way in which other multi phased developments in Town have proceeded, is that the developer's contractor would strip and

stockpile all of the topsoil while grading and servicing works are taking place on the entire site. 6 stockpile locations have been identified. The intent would be to use the topsoil from the stockpiles as each area is built out. The locations of the stockpiles are proposed near the area where the topsoil would be eventually used. The topsoil stockpiles and all disturbed areas where no work is expected to take place for an extended period of time would be seeded.

However, as this is a unique infill development, we will work with developer to explore opportunities to phase as appropriate and as possible given the infill nature of the development.

14. Parking and Traffic: The Construction Mgt Plan proposes that no heavy trucks will be parked on our existing streets. I propose that *no construction vehicles or personal vehicles* of the many on-sites trades people be permitted on our streets as it will create an extremely busy and unsafe environment in our neighbourhood.

There is ample room on the builders land to accommodate their employees. The number of cars currently parked on Sykes (a much smaller building site) is considerable, and only tolerable because it is a less busy streets. This will not be the case on Crossland Gate and Eagle Street.

Furthermore, we have noted on the McGregor site that the construction crew tends to take control of traffic control on the street when it suits their purposes. The streets being affected in the Marianneville sites are bus routes and busier roads, especially during rush hours. This approach would be very disruptive, if permitted.

We will require that all construction related vehicles, including personal vehicles of site workers be parked off the existing road network.

15. Access/Egress points: Apart from Sykes/Bathurst, every access point to our community is being proposed as entry/exit points for the builders. This will exacerbate traffic in Glenway incredibly. As an alternative, I would recommend that other access points be identified, including ones entering off Davis (and in addition to 'Street B'), even if only temporary (ie. direct access into their commercial site identified). I recommend that this idea be 'sold' to the Region given this exceptional, infill situation.

The Town's Engineering Services Department can request the developer to explore such opportunities with the Region of York.

16. Housing stock: the type of houses being contemplated was not presented so residents either still don't know what is being proposed behind them, or have to dig to find out

whether certain configurations have already been sorted out. As this was a PIC meeting where the community was being presented with what was coming, this seems to be a significant missing piece of information - especially if this is the only PIC that will occur.

While specific house designs are currently not available for individual lots, the zoning by-law provides for the type (single detached vs townhome), location on the lot, height and maximum area of a dwelling unit.

Architectural control guidelines have been prepared which discusses the housing types and styles including where dwelling will require an upgraded façade.

17. Where is Playground equipment going?

The approved plan includes approximately 2 hectares of publicly owned parkland in the vicinity of Glenway Circle. The parkland will include both passive and active recreation opportunities including playground equipment for children.

18. What are the timelines for the phases of development?

Phase one includes the Townhouse block in the location of the former clubhouse as well as the lands between Eagle Street, Peevers, Brammar and Millard. It is difficult to predict when grading and development will start in these areas as it depends on the developer satisfying all of the Town's and other agencies' conditions. Should the developer satisfy all draft plan and site plan conditions in 2015, it is conceivable that grading could begin in the fall of 2015 or spring 2016.

19. Is there an opportunity to have bird/butterfly friendly plantings in the open space areas?

Yes, bird and butterfly friendly planting will be included in the landscape plan for open space areas.

20. Can a trail be implemented between lots 82 and 81?

The Town had requested the developer provide a trail in this location however, we understand that due to the design of the adjacent storm water management facility, a trail connection in this location is not possible.

21. Allow through traffic at the Crossland Gate and Davis Drive intersection?

As Davis Drive is a Region Road, Region of York staff investigation and approval for this would be required, upon request.

22. Should have been a provision for a new school in the development. Not advisable to send students across Hwy 9.

The York Region District School Board have reserved a site in both the Marianneville subdivision as well as the Sundial Homes subdivision on the north side of Davis Drive through the conditions of draft plan approval. To date the Board have not released either site. Provisions relating to the School Board requirements will be included in subdivision agreements. Ultimately, it is the School Board who determines need and timing for schools.

23. Rational for not signaling Eagle and Millard Intersection and Eagle and Peevers intersection? The traffic report identified deficiencies during peak hours.

Both of these intersections are presently operating under all-way stop control, which is considered to be the appropriate form of control for the traffic volumes forecast. The traffic volumes and delays at these intersections do not meet either the minimum volume warrants or the minimum delay warrants required by Book 12 of the Ontario Traffic Manual (which is the current standard used by municipalities in Ontario) and therefore traffic signals are not recommended. The forecast capacity and Level of Service for all turning movements at these intersections are expected to be good to beyond horizon year 2026.

24. I understand there is no gates into private roads. Please ensure this continues through applicable site plan/condo agreements.

The Town does not permit gates from private property to private property. Marianneville had indicated that where there are existing gates that have previously accessed the golf course, they will be removed and fencing will be reinstated. There continues to be an application process for homeowners who abut public land to apply for permission to install a gate through the Town offices.

25. What was the development behind the introduction of the motor vehicle service station in the CR-2-127 zone? Are there further approvals/review for this use should it be built?

The request to include a motor vehicle service station within the permitted uses of the commercial block was requested with the original applications. This block is under site plan control and site plan approval is required.