

From: [grace.petrucci](#)
To: [Infrastructure and Environment](#)
Subject: [External Sender] re : IE3.7 High Park Movement Strategy - final report
Date: April 24, 2023 1:26:07 PM

This letter is for the Infrastructure and Environment Committee meeting on April 26th regarding the final proposal from the High Park Movement Study.

If the city had implemented a few traffic calming measures and removed and/or dealt with the 'speed' cyclists in the loop years ago, the issues that prompted this study would no longer be a problem.

Also, to be taken into consideration, is the fact that the complaints from constituents in Gord Perks' ward, who want fewer or no cars in the park, probably came from those who are lucky enough to live within walking distance to the park. One must also remember that Gord Perks is anti-automobile.

I would like to know when he, or any other member of this study group, last came to the park, with toddlers, picnic basket and cooler, all by TTC? Or brought some elderly people with mobility issues to the park using TTC.

I've been very lucky to have lived within walking distance from High Park since the late 70s. High Park was the main reason for purchasing my house in the area almost 40 years ago. I love the park!

I've been very involved with the park since the early 90s, when the city did a similar survey about the same issues that prompted this recent survey. I was one of the original members of the HP Advisory Committee and later the committee responsible for making the lower part of Colborne Lodge Drive one way southbound, to prevent northbound commuter traffic from cutting through the park, especially during rush hour.

I have been a volunteer coordinator with Friends of High Park Zoo since its inception--the group that kept the zoo open when Rob Ford wanted to shut it down.

I was a joggers, had two dogs, and now walk my neighbours' dog daily, in the park.

I know the park well, and care about it. It saddens me to see how run down it has become over the years, but there never seems to be enough money for improvements or repairs.

I am very upset that this HP Movement study initiated by Gord Perks has wasted far too much of taxpayers' money! Money that could have been put towards repairs and improvements to the park.

I'm not impressed with the work that WSP E & I has done, starting with the **very flawed survey**.

1. Flawed, because it did not reach the majority of park users. I even told the firm during one of their two to three information events at the Bloor St entrance (not every park user comes in at this entrance) that they needed to physically circulate and speak to people. Most park users were not looking for small QR codes posted throughout the park, nor were they searching online for this type of information.

I've spoken to hundreds of people since last summer, while handing out the "equal access petition". Almost no one knew of the HP Movement study.

I stood at the Dream in High Park gates talking to some very frustrated and/or overheated people who found the walk too taxing; many didn't know about the closure on weekends nor the study.

Results of this survey are skewed. I suspect residents in close walking distance who are able, and like the fact that the park is less crowded and quiet when there are no vehicles, filled in the survey. I further suspect that the powerful cycling community that would have connected to many other cycling groups were a large part of the sample; their motto, "They ride at a speed appropriate to the circumstances," not to the rules of the road.

The result of this survey is not a true representation of park users.

2. Flawed, because the choices put forth were too vague; one in particular was nonsensical... 'open all roads to vehicle traffic all of the time'.

"Area-based and time-based road closures" is too vague.

It is absolutely shameful that the park has been closed to vehicles on weekends for six months, depriving many people from enjoying the park.

I had expected that in the last six months, WSP E&I would have experimented with different possibilities. For example:

- a) Posted more obvious speed signage in the actual roadway.
- b) Fines for cyclists **and** vehicles not observing speed limits.
- c) Put in deterrence for 'speed' cyclists, who in my opinion have no right to be **speed training** in the park.
- d) Experiment with **no left turn** from northbound traffic from Parkside Drive into the park during weekday rush hour. Centre Road, continuing to Colborne Lodge Drive, is used as a commuter shortcut.

All you have to do is stand at the stop sign where High Park Blvd diverts left to the playground and right up Centre Road, and count the cars. I did my own experiment and counted cars in a five-minute interval at 5:00pm, then again at 6:15pm. Half the number of cars at 6:15pm going up Centre Road. Far too many extra cars are zooming through the park at rush hour. I witness this almost everyday.

I'm very disappointed and concerned with this 'final proposal'. It has designated the Parkside entrance as the sole entrance to the park, and Bloor Street the only exit a ridiculous plan !

This proposal is destroying the travel network in High Park, by not only encouraging some drivers to double back down Parkside Drive and go through the park again in search of a parking spot, but also create too much traffic, commotion and parking issues in the surrounding residential area , on Sunday if the park is closed to vehicles,

Removing 250 parking spots is unreasonable. Why make it difficult for park users to access the activity or event they came in for? I've watched people unload sports equipment, picnic baskets, coolers, trays of food for large family gatherings, strollers, wheelchairs, tricycles, toys...

Many citizens in this city do not have the luxury of a backyard, and come to enjoy a day out in the park and take advantage of the green space. Why would one want to make it difficult or impossible for them to do this comfortably?

This is not only a park for the residents of the area. From Gord Perks wording, "residents-community" in his news letters, sounds like he is placing too much emphasis on his ward. **High Park is a park for the entire city.** This was John Howard's wish.

West Road is wide enough to increase the size of the sidewalk, plus create a barrier (with low plantings?) to divide the pedestrian sidewalk from vehicles and still have a bicycle lane (an idea from the 1993 draft proposal). Definitely put the speed bumps back, and an obvious crosswalk partway down West Road.

Keeping roads closed on Sunday is discriminatory to people that can't come on a Saturday, and will now have to endure the difficulties of no vehicles in the park, and again creating neighbourhood congestion.

The High Park movement strategy goal: to improve mobility within the park, while prioritizing safety, accessibility, and the park's ecological integrity.

In my opinion, this proposal does not effectively accomplish any of the above statements. It is accomodating the speed cyclists, and removing parking spots to do so. There is nothing in it that addresses the natural environment, a component that needs much attention.

Knowing that Bill 23 will affect an already-strapped city budget, was it really the most appropriate time to carry out this expensive study?

Grace Petrucci

you may share my letter

Why did the Parkside Dr study not think to stop left hand turns into the park, from north bound traffic , at High Pk Blvd. during rush hour. It creates a back up, and causes cars to speed, to get around the back up. The speed cars are going between High Park Blvd. and Westminster Ave. is alarming. I know, since that is my route into the park, almost every day, during rush hour.

The newly installed traffic lights at Geoffrey, don't seem to be solving the speeding issue. They are not synchronized

properly.