

**From:** [Mimico Tenants' Association](#)  
**To:** [Planning and Housing](#)  
**Subject:** Planning and Housing Committee on Item PH22.1  
**Date:** April 21, 2021 6:53:28 PM

---

## **Planning and Housing Committee on Item [PH22.1](#) – Christie's Planning Study - City-Initiated Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines - Final Report .**

April 20, 2021

PRESENTATION TO THE PLANNING AND HOUSING COMMITTEE April 21, 2021

Amendment No. 506 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN

This Plan has a lot to recommend it BUT,

I perceive that it is also regrettable that our planners seem to hold back their talents because they are resigned to the fact that it is not we who approve or disapprove: that honor is taken away by the province. So, it is doubly necessary that we weigh in when we need to.

On the specifics of responsibility, the plan seems strong. It holds the developer to a specific number of performance standards -- other areas, not so much. I depute because in one important area we can still make a difference. This plan is building the equivalent of a city. Its construction will be with us for at least the next 25 years and yet its transportation plan is not complete. In fact, on a couple of points, it is uncertain where planning stops and transportation begins. The TMP was postponed at committee for the last two meetings, yet vital pieces of information along with unattributable assumptions exist on what council is expected to rule.

**The Secondary Plan specifically instructs you to read the plan in conjunction with the policies of The Transportation Plan (this can be found under the subhead Mobility under 6.1 Network Mobility Initiatives on page six.**

Specifically, what prevails when planning rules contradict human rights? I believe the answer should be firmly entrenched in The Secondary Plan. For example, parking would appear to include charging stations for Electric Vehicles. But neither are mentioned in The Plan. Although delivery vehicles, work vehicles, visitor parking and rental vehicles will and must be on site constantly, no reference is made. So, will these be subtracted from resident spaces? Or will these vehicles end up on roadways in the development. There is no mention of on-street parking within the project.

The Christie plan claims to hold human rights to accessible housing to a very high level yet the roads leading to Parklawn GO Station will not allow the one in four residents with mobility issues of the one in four Torontonians who will be Seniors during construction to "walk or cycle" to use it. The sidewalks have been widened slightly to 1.8 metres to allow wheelchairs to pass with inches of clearance, but there is no explanation as to why not wider and what happens when a pedestrian is also in the mix.

So, where does Planning stop and Transportation begin? And remember, you are held to read the non-existent TMP while you are deciding on your vote.

**We must press the Pause Button.**

This will allow the Transportation Committee to catch up in order for this committee to comply with The Secondary Plan instructions.

Likewise, the LPAT decision on which you are expected to vote was distributed to stakeholders on April 15th to be voted on at this council meeting only seven days later. It would seem that a further delay so you can vote on a complete plan is the minimum we can do to when building a city, within a city, right.

The consensus of experts worldwide is that individual vehicle use will continue to rise with the population and yet the secondary plan allots a laughably small amount of attention to "parking". The objective is to eventually have no parking at all. However, in an area of the city where there is no off-project parking for visitors, for family, for delivery vehicles and more important still for the working vehicles which will be undoubtedly on site forever, a final transportation plan is essential.

Remember, The Secondary Plan specifically instructs you to read the plan in conjunction with the policies of The Transportation Master Plan (again, this can be found under the subhead Mobility under 6.1 Network Mobility Initiatives). Secondly, in talking to the planners there is a Gray area between planning and transportation when it comes to some of the issues like new technology and human rights. We have no mention in the master plan of electric vehicle charging stations, for example. We must have clarification or you will end up with builders taking the route of least resistance and no consideration for human rights to accessibility. ie. does charging remove parking from another sector?

I repeat, this master plan is building a city within a city. Furthermore, this city is across the street from another massive development which was not handled well and now Christie site developments must partly make up for its transportation deficits. The TMP was postponed at committee for the last two meetings and we still need vital pieces of information.

If we are to deliver the high level of inclusion as boasted by the Christie developers, we need a bit more time. Please give us and Transportation that time. Thank you.

**Starr Smith**  
**Chair**

--

**META**  
**Mimico Estates Tenants' Association**