



Hogg's Hollow Storm Water Management and Road Improvement Study

Community Review Meeting
June 13, 2005

Public Consultation Report
June 21, 2005

Hogg's Hollow Storm Water Management and Road Improvement Study

Public Consultation Report

July 4, 2005

Report Context:

Hogg's Hollow is located in the valley area east of Yonge Street, south of York Mills Road, west of Highland Crescent and north of and including Doncliffe Drive. In 2002, a study was initiated in this area to:

“determine the extent and causes of flooding within the Hogg's Hollow area, and define a program consisting of stormwater management, drainage and road improvement works to alleviate flooding.”

The Study is being conducted under Schedule 'B' of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA), June 2000. According to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, public consultation is an important part of such processes. For projects designated as Schedule B, there are two mandatory points of public contact: the first one to discuss the problem or opportunity and alternative solutions; and, the second one at study completion. During the course of the EA process for the Hogg's Hollow Study, four public meetings and one informal discussion were held with members of the Hogg's Hollow community. Information about the outcomes of each of these meetings is available on the city's website at:

http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/wes/techservices/involved/www/hoggs_hollow/index.htm

In addition to these community-wide events, project staff met with members of the York Mills Valley Association several times, and with some local residents individually to discuss their properties. The Toronto Region Conservation Authority and relevant City departments were also involved in the study process. Although this is well beyond the regulatory requirement, the level of sustained interest in the study within the community, particularly as the study was finalized, warranted the additional attention.

Community Review Meeting

In June, 2005, a Community Review meeting was held. The meeting was held prior to the completion of the EA study report and before a staff report seeking approval was submitted to the City's Works Committee. The purpose of this meeting was to:

- Fulfill the City's commitment to area residents to meet before submitting report to complete EA requirements;
- Provide context for the recommendations contained within the EA and staff reports;
- Identify issues, responses and key outcomes from the October 2004 consultation meeting and the Class EA study;
- Identify recommendations for detailed design; and,
- Explain the City approvals process, the public review process that follows, and other later opportunities for public comment.

This report is a summary of the key issues that were raised by stakeholders during the Community Review meeting, a description of the outcome at the City's Works Committee, and the next steps. The meeting minutes are contained in a separate document (Summary Notes), which can be found on the City's web site.

Key Issues

The meeting was a final opportunity for the community and the project team to discuss outstanding issues before the staff report (and the associated EA report) were submitted for approvals. The issues raised at the Review meeting were similar to those raised during the 4th public meeting and open house held in October 2004. Issues raised at the review meeting, along with any related resolutions, are outlined below.

1. Meeting Notification

Approximately 25 Hogg's Hollow residents attended this meeting. Due to a distribution error, residents were given one week notice of the meeting. This could account for the low attendance. Very few phone calls were received from residents who were not able to attend due to the shorter notification period. The issues raised at the meeting were consistent with those that were heard during the latter part of the process.

2. "Speed Bumps"

Issue: A number of residents felt that new, smooth streets would invite more traffic, travelling at higher speeds. City staff indicated that traffic calming was not within the scope of this EA study. Installation of traffic calming features is based upon an analysis of a number of factors, including the number of cars on the street, their speed and the percentage exceeding posted speed limits.

Resolution: Staff indicated that residents could be canvassed at the Detailed Design stage, and the City's "Traffic Calming" protocol engaged at that time, if necessary. This was acceptable to residents.

3. Curb/Boulevard Treatments

Issue: Residents emphasized the concern that new roads would alter the rural character of the community. This unique character is the reason why many residents chose to live in the area. White concrete curbs and black topped roads with yellow lines down the middle are not acceptable. Residents and city staff presented different options for curb and boulevard treatments that have been used in different areas of Toronto. From a maintenance perspective, the key will be to choose a material and colour that can be easily replicated when maintenance needs to be done.

Resolution: Staff indicated that residents of each street could be canvassed at the Detailed Design stage to determine the one preferred curb and boulevard style and colour for their entire street (regardless of whether parts of it be in any or all of the Priority "A", "B" or "C" groupings). This was acceptable to residents.

4. Road Alignment

Issue: Some residents were not satisfied with a 7.2 metre road width. It was suggested that the road be narrowed, as it was on some of the other streets (the exceptions), especially on short streets that aren't well travelled. One solution that was helpful was to consider varying the road alignment from the centre line of the road.

Resolution: Determination will be made at the Detailed Design stage for each street, as it comes up for construction, whether and where it is possible for the design to include "meandering" (with/without expansion of road pavement width) and/or deviation of the road pavement from the center line of the road allowance. This was a compromise that residents accepted.

5. EA Review

Issue: Staff indicated that it is likely that the project will be implemented over a period of at least 10 years. Streets in Priority Area A would be reconstructed first, but not necessarily within the same year. Timing is dependant upon capital budget funding allocations and needs across the rest of the City. This was not satisfactory to some residents, especially those who have experienced flooding and can no longer secure insurance. Residents, who are not in favour of the project proceeding, were not concerned with the long implementation period.

Resolution: Under the EA Act, undertakings are to be reviewed every five years during implementation, especially in light of changing conditions in the study area. The 5-year review provision in the EA rules seems to address some of concern/preferences of some of the residents for re-evaluation of the nature and extent of impact areas after completion of the Priority "A" work.

6. Parking Restrictions

Issue: Staff are recommending parking restrictions in the Study Area, based on a number of factors, including pedestrian, community and vehicular safety, and ability to offer appropriate service levels to the community (waste removal, snow clearing, fire and ambulance services). Restrictions are being suggested to counterbalance the 7.2 metre road width recommended in the study. The community does not support this direction, as currently there are no parking restrictions and all services are adequately delivered. It was felt that the parking difficulties in the valley are largely associated with contractor vehicles. There was some sentiment expressed that on-street parking could not be taken away, and if restrictions were put in place, they would not be enforced.

Resolution: Various options were discussed, including “lay-bys” and wider pavements on meandering roads that could potentially accommodate different parking scenarios. The process whereby parking restrictions are put in place is a political one, initiated at the time a road is constructed or rebuilt. There were some suggestions that residents would ask the Works Committee to consider delaying the consideration of any parking restrictions in the Valley at least until the completion of all Priority A streets. At that time, an analysis could be done to determine whether or not parking restrictions would actually be necessary. This issue was not fully resolved at the meeting.

Analysis of Key Issues

During the meeting, it was possible to find potential solutions to most of the issues, as outlined above. Staff committed to reflect the solutions within the EA Report and the staff report to the Works Committee. The outstanding issue was related to the imposition of parking restrictions. Staff and the community committed to continue to discuss this issue and present options to the Works committee for consideration.

Stakeholder Comment Sheets

Participants were given a comment sheet and invited to provide any additional feedback not expressed during the meeting. Three comment sheets and one letter were returned. Comments included:

- No speed bumps
- Currently: no parking restrictions; pedestrian friendly; rough road so traffic is slower; casual country feeling. Proposed: parking restrictions; dangerous for pedestrians; better for ambulance; smooth road so faster traffic; hard, efficient feeling. Suggest 6.0 m asphalt surface; pavers at sides replicate current shoulders; full width of 7.2 m or wider for ambulance; no parking restrictions because there are no curbs.
- Don't raise my taxes in order to give a street with no parking and drastically change the character of my neighbourhood.

A letter was also submitted, outlining a survey that was completed by residents on Doncliffe Drive in November 2004. The letter states that approximately half of the area residents responded to the survey. The following conclusions were put forward:

- A clear majority support sewers and repaving the street;
- A substantial majority (85%) do not support the installation of curbs or a clear definition of the road edge;
- If we have to have curbs, the substantial majority prefer asphalt to concrete curbs;
- Parking restrictions would be protested; and,
- The apparent omission of the very top end of Doncliffe Drive needs to be taken into account.

These comments will be reviewed by the study team and be used as background during the detailed design phase, should the EA study receive approval by City Council and the Minister of Environment.

Works Committee Meeting – June 29, 2005

On Wednesday, June 29, 2005, the City of Toronto's Works Committee considered the staff report related to the Hogg's Hollow Storm Water Management and Road Improvement Study. No public deputations were heard on the matter.

The Works Committee recommended that:

(a) City Council adopt the staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the report (June 14, 2005) from the Executive Director, Technical Services;

(b) the Acting General Manager, Transportation Services be directed to defer enactment of parking recommendations for reconstructed roads until after the completion of Priority Area "A", which will be subject to consultation with the Fire Chief and discussion at North York Community Council;

(c) at the commencement of the Design Phase, the Acting General Manager, Transportation Services, in co-operation with the local Councillor, convene a meeting of the community to consider alternative curbing styles and that, specifically, curbing discussed in the June 13, 2005 meeting be permitted as an option, and that staff assist in reaching a community consensus on curbing; and

(d) the Acting General Manager, Transportation Services, in consultation with residents of the community, be requested to consider variable road widths exceeding 7.2 metres on selected roads during the detailed design phase and, where wider road widths are considered, the principle of tree preservation continue to be paramount.

(Report 7, Clause 1)

Next Steps

City Council will consider this matter at its meeting on July 19 - 20, 2005. Should the staff report receive approval, a Notice of Study Completion will be circulated within the community and in the local newspaper. The EA report will be made public for a 60-day review period. This review will commence on August 3 and go to October 3, 2005. The City will work with residents to address any issues identified during this period. Outstanding issues will be considered by the Minister of the Environment. If the EA is approved, capital funding will be sought, community consultation and detailed design completed and implementation will begin.

This public consultation report, along with the summary notes from the Community Review meeting will be made available to the community via the City's project-related web page. Any comments or questions should be directed to Tracey Ehl.

Prepared by:
Tracey Ehl, Principal

E H C



Ehl Harrison Consulting Inc.
(905) 825-9870
tracey@ehlharrison.com