



April 9, 2013

**Etobicoke York Community Council
Agenda Item EY23.6 - Final Report - Mimico-by-the-Lake Secondary Plan**

These comments are submitted on behalf of CCFEW, Citizens Concerned about the Future of the Etobicoke Waterfront. In March 2012 we responded to the Mimico 2020 Revitalization Initiative and are here this evening to comment on the draft Secondary Plan. At that time we made recommendations to you on Sustainable Design, Parks, Recreation and Waterfront, Housing, Land Use - Built Form, Transportation, Business - Economic Development and Promotion, Infrastructure - Public Realm and Heritage.

As a local environmental community organization we are, and continue to be, actively engaged in improving the environmental health of the Etobicoke waterfront.

In general we appreciate the efforts of the Etobicoke York Planning Department and offer our support with some changes to the draft Secondary Plan. My comments will conform to the outline of the draft plan:

Urban Structure

We are pleased to see that the Mimico 2020 Design Guidelines will be used to achieve the goals and objectives of the draft plan but we would note from bitter experience that Design Guidelines are just that, guidelines, and over time they do not stand the test and are frequently ignored as they have been at Humber Bay Shores.

We would recommend that a legal document be signed by all proponents upon submitting any development proposals that they will comply with the Urban Design Guidelines. Such document will assure the community that developments will fall within the policies recommended in Section 4.2.4 (a) (b) and (c).

We are also pleased to see that public art within the private development sites is included.

Housing Renewal and Energy Conservation - We support all of the recommendations in this section. The rehabilitation of the building buildings is our preference and the re-use, whenever appropriate, of any building materials that can be salvaged from the apartment buildings should also be considered.

Transit

We have made several recommendations about the Long Branch 507 Streetcar system being routed to the Dundas Subway Station and to date have not received a response or comment from anyone.

We would ask Community Council to direct TTC staff to respond to our recommendation about routing the Long Branch Street Car to Dundas Subway

We also requested that as an alternative that we return to the Long Branch 501 loop system which would provide more regular and reliable service for residents to move from the Humber Loop to the Long Branch Loop.

Again, we would ask Community Council to direct the TTC to respond to our recommendations.

Cycling and Pedestrian Network

We support the recommendations in the plan.

Parks and Open Space Areas

We support the policies in the plan but would prefer that Section 4.5.9 be amended to include the City Wide Alternative Rate for Parkland which we believe to be .5 hectare for every 300 units... This way there is no confusion over what the parkland rate is. Our preference is for public land dedication and expansion of existing parks and parkettes. We also believe that the plan should incorporate the extension of the waterfront park system to Miles Road which already has a parkette and again over towards Royal York Road. Section 37 benefits or parkland contributions could be used to further the extension of the waterfront linear park.

We understand that this section of the plan has a site specific by-law which we believe should be amended as follows:

Special Policy Area 1-Map 33-6

The area identified as 'Subject to Site Specific Review -1' located within Precinct F on Map 33-6 contains a concentration of significant heritage resources including buildings and landscapes. As such, the proposed built form will be subject to a site specific review at the precinct plan and development application stage to ensure that the proposed development addresses the heritage resources in an appropriate and sensitive manner. To assist in this review, a Heritage Impact Assessment be submitted by the proponent to the satisfaction of the City.

And further that the precinct plan require any road improvements to be located on private land in an appropriate manner to the satisfaction of the city.

Community Services and Facilities

We are concerned about the wording under Section 4.6.3 which states that new, renovated or expanded community services and facilities required for the Secondary Plan area can be located within or in close proximity to the Secondary Plan area, or in locations offering convenient access along major transit lines.

We would like Section (a) to be amended as follows:

(a) located within the Secondary Plan area.

Heritage

CCFEW takes a holistic approach to the environment which includes heritage. Mimico has a rich history that should be protected and preserved as we move forward. CCFEW supports the heritage policies of the secondary plan and the designation of the buildings and landscaping features of the Ormsby/Franceschini Estate (Mimico Estates) that is also being discussed tonight.

Several apartment buildings have art deco features in the entrance and hallways and should be re-used or incorporated into any new buildings

Natural Environment and Energy

We support the intent and the policies in this Section but would prefer that Sections 4.8.4 to 4.8.7 be amended to change the word ‘encourage’ to **‘required’** .

We note that under the municipal servicing Section that proponents will be required to fund and or construct upgrades and believe that the same wording should be in place for the Natural Environment and Energy section.

Municipal Servicing

We are pleased to see the objectives of the Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines are incorporated into the Plan. Opportunities should be investigated through the design and construction of the public realm to incorporate stormwater management facilities to manage stormwater from the public realm and divert stormwater from the City’s storm sewers. As a waterfront community, we understand the need to improve the health of the water in the lake.

We have suggested through the Wet Weather Plan process that there is an opportunity to “daylight” Superior Creek, now piped under Superior Avenue. We understand that it is not feasible; however we would like the buried creek to be recognized and future development considerations could include either a natural wetland feature (preferred) or a more urban type feature (ie. like Sherbourne Common)

at the foot of Superior Avenue.

With these amendments our organization would be pleased to support the Mimico 2020 Secondary Plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brian Bailey". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Brian Bailey
President,
Citizens Concerned About the Future of the Etobicoke Waterfront (CCFEW)
6 Meaford Avenue,
Toronto, ON M8V 2H5
416-288-3060 Ext.5450 (days)
647-761-2711 (cell)
brian@ccfew.org