

Broadview Avenue Planning Study



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting # 3 Summary

Meeting

Monday, June 1, 2015, 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Eastminster United Church, 310 Danforth Avenue

Attendance

Name	Organization
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members and Alternates	
Maria Babbage	Skyy Board of Directors
Joanna Birenbaum	Chester Hill Community Association
James Calderone	Broadview Espresso
Rob Corcoran	Chester Hill Community Association
Richard Dabrus	Resident
Vivienne Denton	Todmorden Mills Wildflower Preserve
Anne Ellis	Resident
Meg Floyd	Resident
Steven Mastoras	Whistlers
Marti Milks	Resident
John Purins	Resident
Angela Schutz	Resident
Nick Tunnacliffe	Resident
Neil Walker	Resident
Chris Williams	Resident
Sandra Woolner	Resident
City of Toronto	
Councillor Mary Fragedakis	Ward 29 Councillor, City of Toronto
Daryl Finlayson	Councillor's Office, City of Toronto
Francis Kwashie	Community Planning, City of Toronto
Kyle Knoeck	Community Planning, City of Toronto
James Parakh	Urban Design, City of Toronto
Ran Chen	Urban Design, City of Toronto
Nigel Tahair	Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
Sharon Hong	Heritage Preservation Services, City of Toronto
Anne-Marie Chung	Toronto Parking Authority
Facilitation Team	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Amanda Crompton	Lura Consulting

Meeting Purpose

- Review and discuss the revised presentation for Community Consultation Meeting #3 on “Options and Priorities”

Meeting Highlights

- **Welcome and Introductions**
 - David Dilks (Lura Consulting) welcomed participants to the third SAC meeting for the Broadview Avenue Planning Study
 - David Dilks introduced himself as the independent facilitator for the SAC
 - The meeting agenda (see Appendix A) was reviewed
 - Participants introduced themselves and their interests in the community
 - Councillor Mary Fragedakis thanked the SAC members for attending the meeting and providing their feedback on the presentation material at the last SAC meeting
 - The meeting minutes from the second SAC meeting held on May 21, 2015 were approved as final for posting on the project website
- **Opening Remarks**
 - Kyle Knoeck (Community Planning, City of Toronto) thanked participants for providing their feedback and advice at the last SAC meeting
 - Kyle Knoeck acknowledged that this is a mid-rise planning study and as such the high-rise options have been removed the presentation
 - Kyle Knoeck made mention of a letter submitted to the City from a number of stakeholders and community organizations that listed reasons why the Estonian House site should be moved from Character Zone C to Zone A. He noted that the Estonian House is located on a very unique lot that will likely require site-specific guidance in the final document.
- **Background**
 - Francis Kwashie (Community Planning, City of Toronto) outlined that the planning study was initiated in 2014 after receiving direction from City Council
 - A timeline of future SAC Meetings and Community Consultation Meetings was reviewed
- **Options and Priorities**
 - An analysis of the heritage properties within the study area was presented, along with opportunities for preserving the historic character of Broadview
 - Options for the public realm, the built form and the transportation network along Broadview Avenue were presented
 - The options for improving the public realm focused on streetscape improvements with additional building setbacks, preserving viewpoints, increasing the amount of greenspace and creating connections
 - Francis Kwashie provided a detailed overview of the different options for complementing the existing built form in each character zone
 - The options for Character Zone A include: 1) no change (as-of-right), 2) standard mid-rise and 3) modified mid-rise with a wrapped mechanical penthouse

- The options for Character Zone B include: 1) no change (as-of-right), 2) standard mid-rise and 3) modified 5-storey mid-rise at corner sites
- The options for the corner sites at Pottery Road in Character Zone C include: 1) no change (as-of-right), 2) standard mid-rise and 3) modified 8 to 9-storey mid-rise
- The options for Character Zone D include: 1) no change (as-of-right), 2) standard mid-rise and 3) modified 10-storey mid-rise
- No changes to the existing built form are proposed for Character Zone E
- A number of development principles for the Estonian House site in Character Zone C were presented, including but not limited to: respecting heritage features, providing adequate transitions towards adjacent properties, providing setbacks from TRCA top-of-bank valleys and ravines and having expansive front yard landscaping
- James Parakh (Urban Design, City of Toronto) noted that a number of preliminary sketches have been included in the presentation to illustrate streetscape enhancements and the aesthetic of potential new buildings
- Francis Kwashie concluded that tall buildings were not deemed appropriate for the study area based on an analysis of potential sites for tall buildings
- Francis Kwashie outlined the various ways to plan for the transportation impacts along Broadview Avenue. Three street improvement options were presented:
 1. Short-term option: maintain existing right-of-way configuration and improve the boulevard with street furniture
 2. Medium-term option: negotiate space depending on width of right-of-way as it varies along the study area (e.g., bus lane with sharrows, painted bike lanes, off-peak parking, and sharrows)
 3. Long-term option: reconstruct the street along the study area to either include layby parking with sharrows and one lane of traffic, sharrows with wide sidewalks and one lane of traffic, layby parking with wide sidewalks and one lane of traffic or wide sidewalks with one lane of traffic
- **Discussion and Feedback on the Presentation**
 - Following the presentation, SAC members addressed the following discussion questions:
 1. What feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for Community Consultation Meeting #3?
 2. Do you have any other feedback or advice for staff?
 - A summary of the feedback and advice is outlined in the following section. A more detailed summary (including questions and answers) is provided in Appendix B.
- **Wrap Up and Next Steps**
 - David Dilks asked SAC members for their advice on the proposed approach for gathering feedback at Community Consultation Meeting #3
 - The next SAC meeting will be held prior to Community Consultation Meeting #4 in the Fall

Feedback and Advice

Feedback and advice on the presentation:

- Include more sketches in the presentation to illustrate the aesthetic of the buildings and streetscape (i.e., as shown on Slide 28) in place of the photographs of concrete buildings as shown on slide 29
- Include labelling of the building heights for all massing diagrams
- Clearly explain the redevelopment options for the Broadview/Mortimer intersection (i.e., communicate why you are showing the potential for development - Building A and B - where important viewpoints have been identified) and how these relate to the proposed viewpoints
- Include a cross-section of the street and illustrate what the proposed setbacks will look like
- Illustrate the height restrictions of the Estonian House site after you apply all the conditions laid out in the Avenues and Mid-Rise Buildings Guidelines and apply the site specific principles
- Include more specific requirements for the Estonian House site on slide 42 (e.g., outline that the side yard is adjacent to low-rise houses and therefore requires a 7.5 m setback and 45-degree angular plane)
- Reinforce that the Avenue designation in the Official Plan applies only to Broadview Avenue and not the neighbouring streets
- Include better photography in the presentation (i.e., need a better photo of Whistler's)
- Articulate what makes Broadview so unique and distinct from other neighbourhoods (e.g., proximity to the Don Valley)

Feedback on the options presented:

A. Public Realm Options and Priorities

- Leverage the history of Broadview Avenue and highlight our proximity to the Don Valley by incorporating more greenery into the streetscape
- Use landscaping and greenspace to connect Broadview Avenue throughout the study area
- Require larger setbacks along Broadview Avenue and ensure requirements are specified in the design guidelines
- Ensure setbacks are planted with trees and other greenery
- Better connect the important viewpoints and greenspaces along Broadview Avenue
- Identify Playter Gardens as a significant viewpoint
- Extend the sidewalk near the TTC station
- Expand the sidewalk in Character Zone C and/or add a bike path along that strip
- Use any frontage that is owned by the City to create green connections to the Don Valley
- Use cash in-lieu of parkland and build a park somewhere along Broadview Avenue (e.g., on the site occupied by Building A in slide 39)
- Acknowledge Whistler's as one of the community hubs along Broadview Avenue

B. Built Form Options and Priorities

- Move the Estonian House site to Character Zone A
- Apply the principles of the Avenues and Mid-Rise Buildings Guidelines to the Estonian House site

- Deal with the uniqueness of the Estonian House site by identifying it as a Character Zone A/C site
- Continue to identify the Estonian House site as a unique lot
- Parking and traffic will be an issue if the Sobey's site is redeveloped
- Consider how any new development on the Sobey's site will impact low-rise houses on Mortimer
- Communicate the intent to protect neighbouring low-rise sites from any new development (e.g., suitable setbacks and setbacks will be required)

C. Transportation Options

- Consider reducing the number of lanes on Broadview to one lane of vehicular traffic in each direction in order to provide more space for on-street parking, bike lanes and greenery along the sidewalk
- Plan for a street that safely accommodates vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist traffic
- Broadview Avenue should not be reduced to two-lanes of traffic at this time - continue with the status quo
- Consider having dedicated lanes for buses during the peak hours
- Provide more parking options
- Require higher parking ratios for the Broadview area
- Consider pedestrian safety when thinking about bike lanes on Cambridge Avenue
- Make the pedestrian experience more pleasant and safe (i.e., redevelop the laneway located by the auto body shop)
- Consider providing parking on two sides of the street along certain portions of Cambridge Avenue
- Consider the impact intensification will have on transportation and other infrastructure along Broadview Avenue

Feedback on the planning study:

- Provide more direction on parking and traffic in this planning document
- Address how trash will be picked up along all of Broadview Avenue

Feedback on the approach for Community Consultation Meeting #3:

- Provide an opportunity at Community Consultation Meeting #3 to have a conversation about what makes Broadview Avenue different from other communities
- Support the approach of having "Topic Stations" set up with members of the SAC and City project team available at each station to answer questions
- Provide guidance at the beginning of the meeting on how feedback will be collected and how decisions will be made moving forward
- Make sure all topic areas are discussed at Community Consultation Meeting #3

Appendix A

Meeting Agenda



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Monday, June 1, 2015

7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Eastminster United Church, 310 Danforth Avenue

Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss the revised presentation for Community Consultation Meeting #3 on “Options and Priorities”.

AGENDA

- 7:00 pm **Introductions, Agenda Review and Welcome**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
Councillor Mary Fragedakis, Ward 29 – City of Toronto (or designate)
- 7:10 pm **SAC Meeting #2 Recap, Review and Approval of Meeting #2 Summary**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- 7:15 pm **Revised Presentation – What We Have Heard and Options & Priorities for Moving Forward**
Kyle Knoeck, Community Planning, City of Toronto
Francis Kwashie, Community Planning, City of Toronto
- 7:45 pm **Questions and Feedback on the Revised Presentation**
- Discussion Questions
1. *What feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for Community Consultation Meeting #3?*
2. *Do you have any other feedback or advice for staff?*
- 8:45 pm **Community Consultation Meeting #3 – Desired Outcomes and Proposed Approach**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- 8:55 pm **Wrap-up and Next Steps**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- Community Consultation Meeting #3, June 17th, 6-9 pm @ Estonian House
- SAC Meeting #4, Fall (date and location TBD)
- 9:00 pm **Adjourn**

Appendix B

Q&A, Comments, and Advice



During the discussion, a number of questions of clarification were raised relating to the content of the presentation and the study. A summary of the discussion is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

Q. Which sites have been identified as potential green spaces?

A. The Sobey's and Latter Day Saint sites have been identified as properties where there is potential to include an onsite parkland dedication requirement. This means that if the sites are redeveloped, the developers have to provide parkland.

C. I like the sketch shown on Slide 28.

C. I do not like the photographs on slide 29 because they look too similar to Minto Skyy. There is too much concrete.

C. Tie the area together through landscaping and the connection of greenspaces throughout the Broadview neighbourhood.

C. Include more greenery fronting onto Broadview Avenue.

C. Not sure bike lanes on Cambridge Avenue are a good idea if we consider pedestrian safety.

C. Consider reducing the number of lanes on Broadview to one lane of vehicular traffic in each direction. This will provide more space for on-street parking, bike lanes and greenery along the sidewalk. One of the biggest concerns of the residents in the neighbourhood is pedestrian safety and having a street that safely accommodates vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist traffic.

C. Include measurements of the building heights for all massing diagrams, or include a car or person to illustrate the scale.

Q. Building A and B in Character Zone C represent potential development, yet those sites were identified as viewpoints earlier in the presentation. Why would you propose having buildings on these sites if they provide important viewpoints?

A. Right now these sites are accessible to the public. If a development application comes forward for these sites we want to make sure that they provide privately-owned publicly accessible space (POPS) where people can still access the viewpoints.

C. Include this explanation in the presentation to alleviate confusion.

Q. Why is there no proposed change to Character Zone E? This area includes a mix of single-family homes, small commercial business, etc.

A. Our direction from Council was to study the portion of Broadview Avenue that is identified as an Avenue in the Official Plan. Areas designated as Avenues in the Official Plan are deemed appropriate for intensification. The portion of Broadview Avenue in Character Zone E is not identified as an Avenue or place for intensification in the Official Plan. Based on feedback received from the SAC and residents, the study area was recently extended to include Character Zone E to ensure Broadview is reviewed in its entirety. As planners we never thought there was policy basis to look at this portion of Broadview for intensification, and as such, we are not proposing any changes to the existing built form.

C. I would imagine that in 20 years the City may designate that portion for intensification.

A. At that time we would consider the options.

C. There is a lot of frustration in our community about traffic congestion. Traffic redirects to Broadview Avenue when the Don Valley Parkway is closed. For this reason I don't think it is possible to reduce Broadview to two lanes of traffic. The status quo is probably what is best for Broadview Avenue right now. Perhaps consider having dedicated lanes for buses during the peak hours.

C. There is currently no street parking available.

C. The community fought to have extra parking provided for new buildings.

C. Provide more direction on parking and traffic in the study report.

Q. Require larger setbacks along Broadview Avenue. The stairs for the new townhouses built on Broadview Avenue are located right beside the sidewalk.

A. As shown in the presentation, we are proposing larger distances from the property line to the street edge along the length of Broadview.

Q. Wasn't the main floor of Minto Skyy originally designated as commercial? Why are those units now residential? Since the main floor was designed for commercial, they are located right beside the sidewalk. We need to ensure this doesn't happen in the future.

A. That is an example of a live/work concept that isn't working.

C. The larger setbacks should include trees and additional greenery. We should leverage the history of Broadview Avenue and highlight our proximity to the Don Valley. We should borrow from the aesthetic of the Don Valley and tie more greenery into the streetscape. It is not sufficient to put a tree in a 4x4 square box on the sidewalk.

Q. Who is responsible for streetscaping? Is it the responsibility of the developer or the City?

A. The developer is responsible for redeveloping the streetscape in front of their property. The street trees are then maintained and serviced by the City.

C. Include a cross section of the street in the presentation to illustrate what a 3.5 m setback looks like and what it includes.

A. Although the applications for 796 and 838 Broadview Avenue were submitted before the completion of this study, we asked that they provide a 1 metre setback from the property line, resulting in a 4.8 metre setback between the building façade and the curb.

C. Explain in the presentation that you require a total setback of 4.8 metres, which may require developers to provide additional setbacks from the property line (in the case above, an additional setback of 1 metre was required).

Q. What is the definition of a mid-rise and modified mid-rise building? Are the maximum heights 6-storeys and 10-storeys?

A. A mid-rise building is up to 6-storeys. The modified building is different for each Character Zone. The maximum height for a modified mid-rise shown in the presentation is 10-storeys.

C. Better connect the important viewpoints and greenspaces along Broadview Avenue.

Q. You have received the letter from the community which includes 20 reasons why the Estonian House fits better in Character Zone A. The Estonian House site is not similar to any of the lots within Character Zone C. What do you lose by moving it to Character Zone A?

A. What your letter underscored to me is how unique the Estonian House site is. The lot configuration of the site is unlike anything else in Character Zone A. It is wider and deeper than most of the lots in Zone A.

Q. What about the Toronto Community Housing Corporation's senior's apartments?

A. That is a corner site so the lot characteristics are different. In terms of the backyard/side yard conditions, the depth and the expansive front yard landscaping, these lots are very different. There are some similarities between the Estonian House site and the built form in Character Zone A, but not in terms of the lot configuration. The bottom line is that it is a very constrained site, so even if we put it in Zone A, we have to think about how this site could be developed.

A. I haven't closed my mind to moving the Estonian House site to Character Zone A, but my sense is that people want to move it to Zone A to forestall larger scale development. I am not sure if that would do the trick. Whether the property is included in Character Zone A or C we need to better understand the constraints of the site and how it will fit with the rest of the street.

C. If a 10-storey building is developed on the site, there are potential challenges on providing adequate tapering to transition to the low-rise homes on Chester Hill. If you move the property to Zone A, you are forestalling an effort from a developer to build an even taller building, who can provide the argument that there are already a number of tall buildings in Character Zone C.

C. Thank you for bringing this back to an Avenue and Mid-rise plan.

C. Apply the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines to the Estonian House site. Outline in the presentation that you are applying the principles of the guidelines which require a 7.5 m setback against someone else's backyard. On the Estonian House site there are low-rise houses that require adequate transitioning at the rear and side yards.

Illustrate the height restrictions on this site using a massing diagram after you apply all the conditions laid out in the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines.

C. Address how trash will be picked up along all of Broadview Avenue so we don't have to deal with it on a site-by-site basis. Most people prefer pick-up at the front of the building as opposed to the rear.

C. Extend the sidewalk near the TTC station another 2 metres east. No one is able to use the existing sidewalk because there are so many pigeons overhead.

C. Identify Playter Gardens as a significant viewpoint.

C. When thinking about transportation along Broadview Avenue we need to think beyond vehicular traffic, and also plan for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists. Although it is beneficial to widen the sidewalk, pedestrians don't always follow the sidewalk north/south along Broadview Avenue. A number of pedestrians use the alleyway near Danforth. This alley should be improved to provide a more pleasant experience.

C. Consider providing parking on two sides of the street along certain portions of Cambridge Avenue.

A. Some of the residents on Fulton Avenue wanted double-sided parking on the street because it slows down traffic and acts as a safety buffer for their children.

C. Trees don't have to sit on the ground. Greenery can be part of terraces and wall façades.

C. Many of the tall buildings in Character Zone C have expansive front yard landscaping but the sidewalk is very narrow. Consider making the sidewalk wider in this area and/or adding in a bike path along that strip.

C. Traffic congestion is caused by the streetcars that sit on the north side of Broadview Avenue because they can't get into the TTC station.

C. We are anticipating a substantial amount of development along this street, but there is not a lot of greenspace. Can we take cash in lieu of parkland and apply it to a site somewhere along Broadview? Perhaps the area occupied by Building A in Character Zone C as shown on slide 41. Can this site be developed as a park instead of as a building?

A. We would be happy to follow up with Parks and Recreation and outline that as an option. You likely will not hear much of a report back on that until a decision is made.

Q. What is the impact of all this new development on transportation along Broadview Avenue?

C. Deal with the uniqueness of the Estonian House site by identifying it as a Character Zone A/C site as it has characteristics that are consistent with both. It is helpful that you have identified it as a unique site.

C. Include more specific requirements for the Estonian House site on slide 42. For example, go beyond outlining that any new development must provide adequate separation distances from adjacent properties by stating that the side yard is adjacent to low-rise houses and therefore acts as a rear yard which requires a 45-degree angular plane.

C. Reinforce that the Avenue designation in the Official Plan applies only to Broadview Avenue and not the neighbouring streets.

C. The area surrounding the Sobey's site is already a very busy location. How will traffic congestion and parking be addressed in this area? It would be great to see a greenspace located in this space as outlined in the presentation, but new development on this site will cause more traffic/parking issues. For example, where would people park if development occurred on top of the existing Sobey's?

C. Remove the photo of Broadview Espresso on slide 15.

Q. Are you presenting this slide deck at Community Consultation Meeting #3?

A. A slightly different version of this presentation will be used during Community Consultation Meeting #3. Some of the slides will be removed from the deck and included on panels that can be reviewed by participants during the Open House portion of the meeting.

C. Include better photography in the presentation. For example, use a better picture for Whistler's. The commercial character of the street is important and should complement the beautiful residential areas.

C. Whistler's is an important community spot and should be acknowledged as one of the community hubs along Broadview Avenue.

C. The slide focused on the Broadview/Mortimer intersection is confusing (slide #39). You identified these sites as important viewpoints and then you show different development options. Better explain what is being proposed for that intersection as it is an important area.

C. Clearly outline the intent to protect neighbouring low-rise sites from any new development, stating that there will be requirements to provide suitable setbacks and setbacks.

Q. How will development on the Sobey's site impact single-family houses along Mortimer?

C. I don't have a problem with the Estonian House site being included in Character Zone C because the lot is so constrained and this will determine what can or can't happen there. I don't know how any developer could get a high-rise building on that site.

C. I am happy to hear about the proposed larger setbacks and additional greenery along the avenue.

C. Would the owner of 1010 Broadview need to apply for a severance in order to develop both Building A and B as shown in the presentation?

A. They do not have to apply for a severance in order to develop two buildings.

C. Clarify that the setbacks are not necessarily public spaces.

A. The setbacks are private property but they feel like part of the public realm and should be designed in a manner that enhances the public realm.

C. Provide more connectivity between greenspaces. Use any frontage that is owned by the City to create green connections to the Don Valley.

C. A narrative is missing from the presentation. You need to outline what makes Broadview so unique and distinct from other neighbourhoods. One thing that makes Broadview so unique is its location next to the Don Valley. Bring more connections and references to the greenery of the Don Valley into the streetscape.

A. Being comprised of Doncaster Village and Todmorden Village, this area of Broadview has a village character as its base. These settlements arose because of the topography and the river. This is a very powerful narrative for the area. We should tie more of this heritage analysis into the narrative.

C. Require higher parking ratios for the Broadview area. For example, new development should be required to provide more than 1 parking space per dwelling unit.

C. Think about how we can make the street interesting, safe and pleasant for pedestrians. Think about what anchors the street and why people are visiting the neighbourhood (e.g., Todmorden Mills, restaurants, etc.).

C. We need to have a conversation at Community Consultation Meeting #3 around what makes Broadview Avenue different from other communities. We need to develop a narrative of what this area is.

C. I like how eclectic Broadview Avenue is.

C. Broadview Avenue was once named Don Mills Road as it was the road to the mill in the valley. The name connected the community at the top of the hill to the valley below.

C. I like the idea of having stations focused on the different themes at the next public meeting and having people from the SAC at these stations, in addition to City Staff, to answer questions.

Q. How will feedback be collected and weighed? Is it a voting process?

A. We are less interested in quantifying the results and more interested in hearing peoples reasons for preferring specific options.

C. Provide guidance at the beginning of the meeting on how feedback will be collected and how decisions will be made moving forward.

C. Make sure all topic areas are discussed at CCM #3.

Q. Can you distribute the PowerPoint presentation in advance of CCM#3?

A. The presentation requires a narrative so we do not like to distribute it until after the public meeting. We will ensure that people have a few weeks after the meeting to provide additional comments.

C. It would be helpful if the SAC could receive the PowerPoint.

A. I am not sure if we can distribute PowerPoint ahead of the meeting, but we might be able to distribute some communication outlining the key points.