



Together our Voice is Stronger!

www.unionvilleratepayers.com

URA Member Meeting Minutes

April 4, 2016

Pan Am Centre

URA Directors:

Peter Miasek, Alick Siu, Gene Genin, Tom Davies, Adam Poon, Donna Day & Reid McAlpine

Regrets: Karen Lui, Keing Li, Kanthini Rajakanthan

Elected Officials:

Councillors: Don Hamilton (Ward 3), Nirmala Armstrong (Regional)

Attendance: Approximately 60 members and guests

1. President's Introduction

The meeting was called to order by URA Director, Gene Genin, at 7:05 PM. Gene welcomed members, elected officials and special guests.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Members reviewed the March 7, 2016 meeting minutes. Consensus to adopt.

3. Membership Report

Donna reported that membership is about 300 households, with 100 paid. A surface mailing will be done to encourage lapsed members to pay up. URA will have a booth at the Unionville Festival in June. A "join URA" blurb will be included in Councillor Hamilton's upcoming newsletter.

The new URA website was unveiled. Kudos to the development team, lead by Alick.

4. Committee Reports & Focus Topics

4.1 URA Transportation Subcommittee

Peter advised the subcommittee is meeting tomorrow and will brief the members in May.

4.2 Unionville Home Society

Community Liaison Committee meeting held March 30. Applications are anticipated to be filed to City staff in May, with discussion at DSC and a Statutory Public Meeting in the fall. Anticipate 2017 will be used for detailed design and approval, with construction in 2018.

Harry Eaglesham (member of Committee) will be setting up a residents' meeting to accumulate comments and questions.

5. Council Updates

Councillor Hamilton advised that the Unionville Main Street golf tourney, to support Unionville, will be in May

Councillor Armstrong spoke about the upcoming OMB review. A group of councillors, lead by Karen Rea, is looking for input by May 17.

6. New Business – Markham Energy Corporation (MEC) Board of Directors Compensation

Mike Gannon briefed the members on this motion which will be debated at Council tomorrow. He read out a deputation that he intended to present to Council. In summary, it stated that

With respect to Item 7 on Council's agenda tomorrow April 5th, the proposal to increase certain compensations for councillors attending MEC meetings. This motion is absolutely wrong on so many counts.

1. There is no staff report, or other explanation outlining the reasons for this compensation. You are voting additional monies for yourselves without giving residents any explanation?? How do you think this looks??

2. Ward Councillors are underpaid with respect to their counterparts in other municipalities. Give them an appropriate increase but do it the right way with supporting data.

3. Nine out of 13 councillors receive the exact same amount of "benefits", or \$20,839. Benefits are normally understood to be variable based on each person's unique situation, be it health care, pension, group insurance cover etc etc. Giving 9 the exact same amount has the wrong optics and requires clarification.

4. Powerstream and MDEI already have Boards. Board members are elected and get compensated. Nobody gets elected to MEC, it is "automatic" based on being an elected councilor. The criteria for being a Board member of the energy companies is disclosed, debated and candidates are elected based on meeting the criteria. Which councilors were elected to Council based on their investment management skills, or their board management skills? Councilors should not get compensated as "Board" members of anything without being elected to that Board based on the correct criteria.

5. MEC is not required anyway. Why does Markham need another body like MEC to oversee specific investments in Powerstream & MDEI? Does MEC oversee our bond acquisitions? Does MEC oversee our investments in community centres? Markham has many significant assets that do not require an MEC to oversee them, they are reviewed in Council, in camera if necessary. The business of MEC is normal council business and does not require an additional compensation model.

The following motion was moved by Peter Miasek and seconded by Reid McAlpine:

“That URA opposes the proposed motion before Council on MEC Director compensation, and supports the deputation of Michal Gannon”. Passed unanimously.

7. Subcommittee Presentation on Zoning Issues

7.1 Backgrounder on Zoning Bylaw Issues and Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Project

Alick Siu presented on this topic. The presentation is on the website. A member commented that enforcement of the bylaws is needed.

7.2 Briarwood Farm (Normandale) Development

Malcolm Lowe, resident of Normandale Road, briefed the members on this proposed development of 13 densely-sited detached homes. Resident concerns include overall density (sub-minimum setbacks), tree preservation, storm water management and a high-risk relocation of the heritage farm house.

The following motion was proposed by Reid McAlpine and seconded by Crystl Reeh. Passed unanimously

The City of Markham has received a proposal to redevelop the Hughes/Briarwood Farm on 16th Avenue.

Periodically other proposals are made to develop lands that affect Markham Ward 3.

If and when the URA takes a position relative to these proposals, it will give due consideration to the following principles:

- *Mature trees should typically be preserved when possible.*
- *Preservation of the natural environment should be encouraged.*
- *Intensification in Special Policy Areas and floodplains should be avoided.*
- *Densities should follow the requirements of the Markham Intensification Strategy (2009/2010) as reflected in the Official Plan (2014).*
- *The scale and density of new development should be appropriate relative to any neighbouring mature developments.*
- *Developments that encourage alternate forms of transportation, including public transit, cycling and walking, should be encouraged.*
- *Developments should be designed to mitigate the volume of vehicular traffic.*
- *Heritage structures on any development site should normally be preserved, restored and renovated.*
- *Heritage structures should normally be retained in their original locations.*

7.3 7 Braithwaite Road minor variance

Neighbouring residents Jim Cloughley and Dave Tenn briefed the members on their experience in opposing a proposed very large home redevelopment at this address. The matter went before the Committee of Adjustment on March 23 and is currently deferred pending further negotiations between the neighbours and developer. Jim and Dave's presentation focused on the lessons learned and will be put on the URA website.

8. Meeting Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:25PM