

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting # 4 Summary

Meeting

Monday, November 30, 2015, 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Estonian House, 958 Broadview Avenue

Attendance

Name	Organization
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members and Alternates	
Maria Babbage	Skyy Board of Directors
Rob Corcoran	Chester Hill Community Association
Richard Dabrus	Resident
Paula Davies	Todmorden Mills Wildflower Preserve
Anne Ellis	Resident
Meg Floyd	Resident
Barbara Korwin	Resident
Andrew Nicholson	Playter Area Resident's Association
John Purins	Resident
Angela Schutz	Resident
Neil Walker	Resident
Chris Williams	Resident
Sandra Woolner	Resident
City of Toronto	
Councillor Mary Fragedakis	Ward 29 Councillor, City of Toronto
Margaret Fitzpatrick	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
Charissa Iogna	Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
Marybeth McTeague	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 draft presentation for Community Consultation Meeting #4 on recommendations for the Broadview Avenue Planning Study

Meeting Highlights

- **Welcome and Introductions**
 - David Dilks (Lura Consulting) welcomed participants to the fourth SAC meeting for the Broadview Avenue Planning Study
 - The meeting agenda (see Appendix A) was reviewed
 - Councillor Mary Fragedakis thanked the SAC members for their participation in the planning study and valuable feedback
 - David Dilks introduced himself as the independent facilitator for the SAC
 - Participants introduced themselves and their interests in the community
 - The meeting minutes from the third SAC meeting held on June 1, 2015 were approved as final for posting on the project website
 - Kyle Knoeck (Community Planning, City of Toronto) thanked participants for providing their feedback and advice on the planning study to date
- **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 the SAC Meetings and Community Consultation Meetings (CCM) was reviewed. It is anticipated that the last CCM meeting will be held in winter 2015
- **Vision**
 - Francis Kwashie summarized the input received from the community on creating a vision for Broadview
 - A set of guiding principles and draft vision statement was presented
- **Character Analysis**
 - James Parakh (Urban Design, City of Toronto) walked the SAC through the unique characteristics that define the streetscape of Broadview Avenue, including but not limited to: building materials, vertical and horizontal rhythm, gaps between buildings, pronounced entrances, green spaces, and viewpoints
- **Heritage**
 - Marybeth McTeague (Heritage Preservation Services, City of Toronto) outlined the following as five important heritage features located within the Broadview community: 1) Don Valley and Don River, 2) Todmorden Mills, 3) Aboriginal trail, 4) Todmorden Village, and 5) Chester Village
 - Recommendations to ensure the preservation and protection of Broadview's heritage context, heritage properties and historic road to Toronto's first industrial site were presented

- **Public Realm**
 - Ran Chen (Urban Design, City of Toronto) presented the public realm recommendations, which include: the creation of a network of park spaces, the incorporation of additional greenspace through the development of large sites (over 5,000m²), the creation and preservation of viewpoints (e.g., views of the valley) and overall improvements to streetscape (e.g., wider sidewalks, tree planters, outdoor furniture)
- **Built Form**
 - Ran Chen outlined that the City recommends a mid-rise built form that does not exceed 6-storeys (or 20m) along the length of the corridor. A detailed overview of the recommendations for the built form in each character zone was presented:
 - Character Zone A recommendations: 6-storey (20m) maximum height, 5-storey (16m) streetwall, 45 degree rear angular plane and 4.8m sidewalk zone
 - Character Zone B recommendations: 5-storey (17m) maximum height, 3-storey (16m) streetwall, 45 degree rear angular plane and 6m sidewalk zone
 - Character Zone C recommendations: 6-storey (20m) maximum height, 5-storey (16 m) streetwall, 45 degree front angular plane, 10m sidewalk zone and 10m setback from TRCA top of bank
 - Character Zone D recommendations: 6-storey (20m) maximum height, 5-storey (16m) streetwall, 10m sidewalk zone and adequate transition to future park and neighbourhood
 - Character Zone E recommendations: no built form changes
 - Kyle Knoeck noted that there are two large sites (+5,000m²) located in Zone D that may support additional density in the range of 7-9 storeys. The increased density could be accommodated without casting shadows on the public realm or adjacent properties or negatively impacting the flow of traffic. These two sites present the greatest opportunity for accommodating a community facility (such as a grocery store or library).
- **Transportation**
 - Anne-Marie Chung (Toronto Parking Authority) provided an update on the off-street parking analysis and outlined next steps to address capacity issues
 - Charissa Iogna (Transportation Planning, City of Toronto) outlined the multiple ways to plan for the transportation impacts along Broadview Avenue. Three potential street improvement recommendations were presented: 1) maintain sidewalk width and existing traffic configuration, 2) maintain sidewalk width with changes to traffic configuration and 3) change sidewalk width and traffic configuration (major reconstruction of infrastructure).
 - It was noted that Broadview Avenue is being considered as one of two corridor options for the Downtown Relief Line
- **Community Services and Facilities**
 - Francis Kwashie outlined that the City's capital budget and Section 37 contribution could be used to support community services and facilities on Broadview Avenue (e.g., a new Toronto Public Library, non-profit childcare facility, etc.)

- **Discussion and Feedback on the Presentation**

- Following the presentation, SAC members addressed the following discussion questions:
 1. Do the recommendations capture our desired vision and future directions for the Broadview Avenue study area? Why or why not?
 2. Should any changes or additions to the recommendations be considered?
 3. What feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for Community Consultation Meeting #4?
- 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 outlined that the final Community Consultation Meeting would take place in early 2016
- Francis Kwashie thanked the SAC members for their hard work and dedication to the Broadview Avenue Planning Study over the last several months

Feedback and Advice

Feedback on the recommendations from SAC members included:

A. Vision Statement for Broadview Avenue

- Further highlight and amplify the characteristics of Broadview Avenue that are unique; specifically Broadview's proximity to the Don Valley and rich history

B. Heritage Recommendations

- Look beyond the study area to gain a better understanding of the "big picture" with regards to heritage

C. Public Realm Recommendations

- Clearly articulate that the view we have of the valley will be changing over time and should not be preserved at the expense of increasing the tree canopy
- Ensure proposed setbacks provide ample walkway space without encroachment
- Consider locating new parkland (e.g., through parkland dedication) at the front of buildings as opposed to at the rear

D. Built Form Recommendations

- Consider the consequences of having 10m rear setbacks from the TRCA top of bank in Character Zone C and propose a solution that will reduce/eliminate garbage dumping into the ravine
- Support was expressed for the proposed 10m setbacks in Character Zone C as Privately Owned Publically-Accessible Space (POPS)
- Consider preserving the sites at Pottery Road and Broadview Avenue as public spaces (not POPS). These sites provide the best viewpoints of the Don Valley.
- Clearly articulate if wrapped mechanical penthouses are permitted within the 20m height restrictions

- Highlight that buildings will be staggered at the rear to provide a transition zone and limit shadow impacts on adjacent low-rise residential homes
- Include the Estonian House in Character Zone A since the proposed height restriction of 6-storeys is the same for Zones A and C
- Ensure future development considers high winds in the area (e.g., consideration of building materials and orientation)

E. Transportation Recommendations

- Undertake a comprehensive transportation study and articulate how intensification will impact the flow of traffic, pedestrians and cyclist along Broadview Avenue as well as along the most sensitive side streets (e.g., Pretoria, Chester Hill)
- Address residential parking issues (as was done for visitor parking)
- Consider how a relief line connection at Broadview Station will impact transit capacity and traffic flow
- Better connect existing and new pedestrian and cycling networks
- Consider the unique street network of the Broadview area when planning for driveway entrances
- Maintain two lanes of traffic in both directions on Broadview Avenue
- Consider the impact increased traffic will have on noise levels

Feedback on permitting building heights of 7-9 storeys in Character Zone D (sites over 5,000 m²):

- Some SAC members expressed their support for potentially allowing taller buildings in Zone D, while several others expressed their opposition to anything higher than 6 storeys
 - Those who support building heights of 7-9 storeys in Character Zone D noted that they were willing to make a trade-off for community facilities as long as ample parking is provided and transportation impacts are minimal
 - The individuals who oppose any buildings taller than 6-storeys outlined that more density will result in increased pedestrian and vehicle congestion in an area that is already suffering from poor traffic flow. It was also argued that community facilities should be provided without having to support additional density.

Feedback and advice on the presentation:

- The presentation as provided was well done
- Provide more detail about some of the key issue areas to improve clarity
- Give the same (or similar) detailed presentation at the next Community Consultation Meeting

Appendix A

Meeting Agenda



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Monday, November 30, 2015
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Estonian House, 958 Broadview Avenue

Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss the draft presentation for Community Consultation Meeting #4 on recommendations for the Broadview Avenue Planning Study.

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 **Approval of SAC Meeting #3 Summary**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- 7:15 pm **Presentation – Broadview Avenue Planning Study Recommendations**
Kyle Knoeck, Community Planning, City of Toronto
Francis Kwashie, Community Planning, City of Toronto
- 7:45 pm **Questions and Feedback on the Presentation**
- Discussion Questions
1. *Do the recommendations capture our desired vision and future directions for the Broadview Avenue study area? Why or why not?*
 2. *Should any changes or additions to the recommendations be considered?*
 3. *What feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for Community Consultation Meeting #4?*
- 8:45 pm **Community Consultation Meeting #4 – 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 #4
- 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. What does 20m in height look like? Does 20m always equate to 6-storeys? Is the Albany Clinic an example of a building that is 20m tall?

A. 20m does not always equate to a 6-storey building; however, the height breakdown is usually 4.5m for ground level retail and 3m for the subsequent residential floors. This equates to 1 level of retail and 5 levels of residential.

A. The Albany Clinic is 5-storeys and about 20m in height. However, the Albany Clinic is built straight up. We are proposing angular planes so the pedestrian experience is improved.

A. We typically control heights in our Zoning By-law and Official Plan using metres as opposed to number of storeys for accuracy.

Q. What does “enhanced” greenspace near valley entrances mean?

A. That refers specifically to the sites at Pottery Road and Broadview Avenue. In order to enhance those green connections we are asking for a setback from the edge of the street to the face of the building of 10m. This will create a more expansive green area near the valley.

Q. What does “preserving viewpoints” and “well-designed look outs” mean? What is the definition of a viewpoint?

A. The Dairy Queen currently has an informal lookout point and we want to preserve and create more opportunities for these types of lookout areas. We are proposing that regardless of what development comes forward, the owner has to preserve and provide public access to this viewpoint.

Q. How much space is there from Pottery Road to the Dairy Queen to create a public lookout?

A. The 10m setback being proposed from Pottery Road is the space for securing public access. It will not be public property but we will require that it be Privately Owned Publically-Accessible Space (POPS).

C. We can see right across the valley when we sit at the Dairy Queen now, but because of Parks, Forestry and Recreation’s plan to improve the ravine and increase the canopy of tree cover there is a lot of planting taking place across the road. Therefore, the view we have of the valley will be changing over time and I would like that recognized in the document.

Q. Is the 10m setback proposed at Pottery Road and Broadview Avenue public space that can be used as an outdoor café area or is it greenspace that you can only walk on the first 1-2 metres?

A. We are going to require that this space be Privately Owned Publically-Accessible Space. This means that the owner will have to agree on title that the space belongs to them, but is accessible by the public.

Q. The latest townhouse development on the east side of Broadview Avenue has stairs that encroach on the sidewalk. In the presentation you discuss increasing the setbacks from street to the building façade, but this isn't a helpful measurement as it would still permit stairways in this space. Measuring to the building façade is not representative of the actual space available for walking on the sidewalk.

A. We aspire to provide for a space of 4.8m that is clear. In this area you would have a tree-planting zone and a walking zone. We are cognizant of this issue and plan to keep the walkway clear of stairs and other obstacles. We do not aspire to recreate the townhouse development you are citing.

Q. You have presented a comprehensive parking study. Have any transportation studies been done on the allowable intensification based on traffic flow? Can the plan include transportation studies in order to define the maximum allowable density based on traffic flow?

A. Transportation planning is much too dynamic to produce a single number like this. To put things into perspective, we talked about 400-500 additional units in total spread out over a kilometre stretch. Vehicle traffic generated by that increase is maybe 100 car trips in a peak hour. We do not anticipate any traffic issues that require reconfiguring the street based on these numbers.

C. We can agree that on Broadview this might be fine, but the narrower streets and more sensitive points along the corridor will feel the traffic impacts the most (e.g., Pretoria and Chester Hill are already constrained). What kind of protection will we have for these areas?

A. Traffic studies would be done as part of individual development proposals.

Q. Has any thought been given to garage entrances off Broadview Avenue? Will that be permitted?

A. From a site-traffic management point of view we don't recommend direct access from Broadview Avenue. This is a fundamental principle for us as we try to minimize the amount of pedestrian disruptions along the street. It is safer to use existing side streets to service developments. That is the first priority, however there are cases where direct access comes from the main street.

C. We have quite a few homes that have access from Broadview Avenue. Part of the issue is that Broadview is considered a main thoroughfare.

C. It is inevitable that you will have driveways to parking garages coming off of Broadview for any future development. To say that is a principle for this corridor is not practical.

A. I am speaking as a generalization. That is one of our fundamental principles.

C. One of the site-specific attributes of this area is that we are bounded by the valley on the west and north. I understand that this principle can be applied when we have a grid pattern, but this area is unique in its formation. This is a good policy when you have a grid, but a bad policy when you are bounded by a ravine.

A. We will have to balance that with the implications of numerous site access points off Broadview and what that means for pedestrian safety.

C. Residential parking has not been sufficiently addressed. You are constantly referring to the parking issues related to businesses and retail, but I haven't heard anything about residential parking – where are people going to park who live here?

C. This is a much improved presentation that highlights the opportunities even though there are constraints.

C. We should be looking beyond the study area from a heritage perspective. There are a number of historic properties outside this study area and it is important to look at the big picture.

C. I have concerns about the 10m rear setback in Character Zone C. Allowing buildings such as 1010 Broadview and 980 Broadview to be built right up to 10m to the top of the ravine bank is suggested in this presentation. This results in a mess of garbage in the ravine. One solution is to consider stepping the building levels back from the rear. Who is going to be responsible for cleaning up behind these buildings? We need to consider prevention measures for this type of encroachment.

C. Traffic and parking are two key issues that still need to be addressed.

C. The presentation as provided worked well. It may be helpful to provide more detail about some of the key issue areas.

C. I am apprehensive about how intensification will impact transportation. If a subway relief line connects with Broadview Station, the four bus routes will not be able to accommodate the increased number of users. If the Don Valley Parkway goes down, Broadview is congested during the middle of the day. We need to address these issues.

C. We are at a place where we have a good plan, but there is an opportunity to go from good to great. We need to identify exactly what it is in the vision statement that is unique to the area and that is the valley and Broadview's heritage. These have been identified in the vision statement, but they need to be further amplified.

C. The 10m setbacks proposed in Character Zone C is positive. This area has the potential to create a destination, drawing pedestrian traffic north on Broadview.

C. There needs to be more emphasis placed on access to the valley and connectivity. Connections don't exist for pedestrians and cycling networks. There are a lot of pedestrian and cycling paths that don't meet with each other.

Q. It is not made clear in the presentation if wrapped mechanical penthouses (WMP) are included in the 20m height restrictions. Are WMP going to be allowed?

A. The intent of the guidelines is not to include WMP. We will make that point more explicit in the presentation.

C. Access and egress needs to be addressed as part of the transportation recommendations before presenting this content to the public.

C. Safety, traffic flow and parking are the main concerns. This neighbourhood has a high walkscore, and people like to walk and bike.

C. The presentation needs to better highlight the staggering of buildings at the rear.

C. I don't see an issue with 7-9 storeys on the two sites in Character Zone D as identified in the presentation. Having said that, you will need to ensure ample parking for residents and visitors.

Q. Once this is all done, what is our guarantee that all these things are going to happen?

A. This study will create two additional tools for us to use as development applications come forward. First, an Official Plan amendment and second, a set of guidelines to help us evaluate applications. We expect that the study recommendations will be achieved through new development. Any application that exceeds the zoning permissions will still have to go through a rezoning process which means we will hold public meetings and will have to explain how the proposed development fits within these policies and guidelines. Part of the advantage of completing a study like this is that it gives clarity to all the different stakeholders involved in this process (e.g., city planners, landowners, developers, residents, politicians). Everyone is made aware of what the rules are and what the process is going to be. If we are successful, future development will be delivering streetscape improvements, public spaces, community services, etc.

Q. When will the City get involved with streetscape enhancements?

A. At some point in the future, Broadview will be reconstructed as a street. All infrastructure has a lifespan and eventually it will need to be reconstructed. When Broadview reaches that time, there is an opportunity to start to implement the streetscape improvements.

A. The street is being resurfaced next year, but not reconstructed. It will be resurfaced with new asphalt.

Q. Does resurfacing include paint and potentially new paint patterns to implement one of the street reconfigurations in the guidelines?

A. No. It will be a road resurfacing, not reconstruction. This means that the lines that are already here will be painted on the new asphalt.

C. I am concerned with the two potentially larger sites located in Character Zone D. The two sites are located right beside Character Zone E which is a stable residential area not planned for intensification. Additionally, this area is already extremely congested. If you build higher, there will be more people and traffic congestion. There are already a lot of short-cuts that happen to avoid the light at Cosburn. The side streets behind Sobey's cannot handle more traffic. I can see the benefits of allowing for more height, such as the community facilities, but congestion will be too severe.

C. A 10m setback from Pottery Road is not enough to preserve viewpoints. The City needs to think about preserving those areas as open spaces. This is the best view in the neighbourhood and should be converted to an open area that has seating, emphasizes Broadview's heritage and is a green gateway. We should strive for absolutely the greatest thing we can do with this study.

C. I oppose any building that is taller than 6-storeys in all zones (including Zone D).

C. The sketch of parkland in Character Zone D is cornered by low-rise houses and a mid-rise building, and because of this formation it does not seem very public. Consider locating the parkland at the side or front of the building so it would be more accessible to the public.

C. There are some benefits to having the parkland in the rear as it provides a buffer from the building to the neighbouring residential homes.

C. I support transportation option # 1 because I don't see anything other than 2-lanes both ways on Broadview.

C. The study should consider wind. We live in a high wind area and future development (particularly on the west side) needs to be designed with wind in mind (e.g., building materials and orientation).

C. Permitting taller building heights is not consistent with the rest of the planning study. This change to the planning study was never discussed previously at the Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings.

C. Permitting taller building heights in Character Zone D would have a negative impact on residents in Skyy and the Broadview Co-op.

C. Transportation needs to be addressed more fully.

C. I think we can handle more height in Character Zone D. I am willing to make a trade-off for community facilities.

Q. Why do we need to build taller buildings (e.g., the proposed 7-9-storeys) to get additional community facilities?

A. The additional height is not just about the community facilities. We think the extra height could be accommodated with fairly minimal impacts to the street and adjacent homes. The buildings would be setback from the street and provide sufficient transition to neighbouring residential homes that will deal with any shadow impacts. If an application comes in and it is 8-storeys, even with these guidelines, we may find it challenging to argue against that height. The additional density that comes with a taller building will make a community facility more possible because of the additional revenue that may be generated from Section 37 contributions.

Q. I didn't see anything in the presentation about the alleyway located by the dry cleaners. Is that alley going to be made greener?

A. It is reflected in the slides. Our recommendation is to improve the alley to make it more pedestrian-friendly. There is no additional room for landscaping and greenery.

Q. I am concerned about the use of the word "guideline". Can these be rules not guidelines?

A. There are two deliverables that will emerge from this process. One is a set of guidelines that will have all the details. The second is an Official Plan amendment that will include the key points, particularly the height and setback recommendations.

C. There should be something in the presentation about planning for transportation.

C. The Estonian House should be included in Character Zone A.

A. If we put the site in Character Zone A, the development principles will remain the same.

A. If we look at Zone A, the guidelines that we are bringing forward are about building upon and preserving the existing character. Zone B is like that as well where we are preserving and building upon the existing diagonal and shallow lots. In Zone C we are not building on the existing character. Instead, we are recognizing the constraints to the sites that have some development potential. In Zone D we are actually trying to build some character. I think Estonian House fits the story of Character Zone C. It is a large site that on the surface appears to have development potential, but in reality has many constraints due to its narrow dimension, relationship the valley, close proximity to residential houses on Chester Hill and its' heritage designation. We are currently including the site in both Zone A and C, recognizing that it has a role to play in transitioning between the two zones. Ultimately, what is recommended for the site is a building that does not exceed 6-storeys, which is the same as Zone A.

C. I understand, but I think we will all have an easier time at the public meeting if it's located in Zone A. If the height requirements are the same, let's move it to Zone A.

C. Not enough consideration has been given to the effects on the residential communities located to the west and east of Broadview. Parking and traffic are already concerns and these issues will increase with intensification.

C. Although the presentation is long, I think it would be worthwhile to present to the public. This could be achieved by having a "pre-meeting" for those that are interested before the roundtable/open house format.

A. The intent is to give a fulsome presentation at the Community Consultation Meeting.

C. Noise level needs to be considered.

A. We look at noise levels on a site-by-site basis as applications come in.

Q. When will this presentation be available online?

A. We will send the presentation slides to the members of the SAC tomorrow.

Written Feedback

A few members of the SAC provided additional comments and advice via email. A summary of the feedback received is included below.

C. A transportation plan should identify Broadview/Danforth as a major transportation hub. The plan needs to address how to get people to and through the intersection efficiently and safely.

C. If transportation is defined as moving people from A to B, then we can break it down into: walking, mass transit, driving and cycling. When we think of all modes of transport, we would move sidewalk improvements to the transportation section in the presentation.

C. "Seek opportunities to make the laneway more pedestrian friendly" is a pretty weak statement on slide 42. Add words such as, "...by creating a woonerf, encouraging commercial uses such as...".

C. Slides (43-44) on the public realm are not clear. I support wider sidewalks to encourage residents of the new development to walk. At an earlier meeting there was some discussion about going on to private land to achieve this. What is not clear is whether the wider sidewalks proposed can be accommodated within the road right of way.

C. I would like to see a commitment to public ownership or at least publically accessible viewpoints at Broadview and Mortimer.

C. I agree with the objective of adding parkland on the two sites identified (slide 47).

C. I agree with the objective of creating view points of the Don Valley at Pottery Road and to create a green corridor linking Broadview Avenue to the Don Valley (for environmental and heritage reasons), but the simulation of what buildings might be permitted on the two parcels fills me with dread. The green area should be significantly larger. On the site south of Pottery Road that might be achieved by allowing the developer to breach the 6-storey maximum height limit in return for a significant public land dedication. This can be justified on the basis the tower to the south and Minto Skyy both significantly exceed 6-storeys. I do not know if the same principal can be applied to the Dairy Queen site that results in a buildable building. At the very least I think you should have another look at these two sites. Do the TRCA regulations negatively affect the buildable area on these sites? (Slides 73 and 74)

C. I think the section on transportation could be improved. It seems more aspirational rather than grounded in analysis. A major gap is the lack of treatment of cycling. To sluff it off on the City's forthcoming bicycle plan pushes things to the future without any guarantee of the role cycling should play on Broadview. My interpretation of this situation is that cycles are vehicles and therefore they will share the one lane of traffic in each direction provided on slide 90. Given that lane is meant to accommodate all traffic including cars and trucks is that going to be tenable in the future?