

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting # 2 Summary

Meeting

Thursday, May 21, 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
Rob Corcoran	Chester Hill Community Association
Paula Davies	Todmorden Mills Wildflower Preserve
Vivienne Denton	Todmorden Mills Wildflower Preserve
Stephen Ginsberg	Resident
Corey Jong	Resident
Barbara Korwin	Resident
Rick Martin	Resident
Marti Milks	Resident
John Purins	Resident
Angela Schutz	Resident
Halina Szegidewicz	Resident
Nick Tunnacliffe	Resident
Linda Veltmann	Estonian House Board of Directors
Chris Williams	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
Jason Tsang	Community Planning, City of Toronto
Facilitation Team	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Amanda Crompton	Lura Consulting

Meeting Purpose

- Provide an update on the study process and timeline
- Preview and discuss presentation materials for Community Consultation Meeting #3 on “Options and Priorities”

Meeting Highlights

- **Welcome**
 - David Dilks (Lura Consulting) welcomed participants to the second SAC meeting for the Broadview Avenue Planning Study
 - David Dilks welcomed the two new SAC members (Corey Jong and Marti Milks) who reside in the extended study area
- **Introductions**
 - David Dilks introduced himself as the independent facilitator for the SAC, noting that Lura Consulting is the neutral third party facilitator of community engagement for the study
 - David Dilks reviewed the meeting agenda (see Appendix A)
 - The meeting minutes from the first SAC meeting held on December 15, 2014 were approved as final for posting on the project website
 - Participants introduced themselves and their interests in the community
- **Background**
 - Francis Kwashie (Planner, City of Toronto) welcomed SAC members and thanked them for attending the meeting
 - An update on the study process and timeline was provided
 - Francis Kwashie provided an overview of the feedback collected from Community Consultation Meeting #2 as it relates to the study area boundary, character zones and vision for Broadview
- **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 built form, the public realm and the transportation network along Broadview Avenue were presented
 - Francis Kwashie provided a detailed overview of the different options for each character zone
 - The options for Character Zone A include: 1) standard mid-rise and 2) modified mid-rise with wrapped mechanical penthouse
 - The options for Character Zone B include: 1) standard mid-rise and 2) modified mid-rise of 5-storeys at corners
 - The options for the corner sites at Pottery Road in Character Zone C include: 1) 18-storey tall buildings, 2) 8-9-storey modified mid-rise and 3) tall buildings + mid-rise building
 - The options for the Estonian House property in Character Zone C include: 1) standard mid-rise and 2) modified 34m mid-rise
 - The options for Character Zone D include: 1) tall buildings of 18-storeys transitioning to 16-storeys and 2) modified 10-storey mid-rise

- No changes to the existing built form are proposed for Character Zone E
 - The options for improving the public realm focused on expanding the boulevard widths, preserving viewpoints, increasing the amount of greenspace, creating connections and planting more trees
 - 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 based on the analysis and work completed to date?
 - 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**
 - Councillor Mary Fragedakis thanked the SAC members for their participation and feedback
 - There was consensus among SAC members that the June 1st SAC meeting is needed to review a revised presentation

Feedback and Advice

Feedback and advice on the presentation:

- Clarify that the analysis was conceptual and theoretical with a view to establishing the maximum permitted densities and heights in each Character Zone
- Clearly communicate that some of the options presented are unrealistic (e.g., a tall building on Estonian House) based on this analysis
- Communicate that you heard from most community members that they don't want tall buildings along Broadview, but that you did your due diligence of all options. Clearly state that based on the analysis, plus the added constraints on infrastructure, it is very unlikely and unrealistic to build tall buildings along Broadview Avenue
- Provide the planning context and rationale at the beginning of the presentation (i.e., the Official Plan designates Broadview as an Avenue)

- Include a slide illustrating the sort of development provided for under the existing by-law
- Start the presentation by outlining how this is going to benefit the Broadview community
- Consider leading with the public realm options instead of the built form options
- Outline that the streetscape improvements can be completed in the short-term and that development along Broadview Avenue will occur over time
- Include a slide in the presentation that defines what is classified as a mid-rise, modified mid-rise and tall building (i.e., how many storeys they are)
- Include photos/images in the presentation to provide people with a visual of what the street could look like (include examples from the Leslieville study as was done in previous presentations)
- Slow down when explaining the various options
- End the presentation by returning to the timeline with the commitment to return in the Fall with an overview of what the draft recommendations and report will include

Feedback on the options presented:

A. Built Form Options and Priorities

- Include a “leave as is” or “do nothing” option in all Character Zones
- Eliminate tall buildings as an option in all Character Zones
- Bring the focus of the presentation back to the standards set out in the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines (i.e., the height of buildings should be equal to the street right-of-way which is 20m along Broadview Avenue)
- Include lines in the massing diagrams showing what is permitted under the existing zoning
- The tall buildings proposed for Character Zone C set a bad precedent because this is not the kind of development we want to see
- Eliminate some of the options to reduce confusion
- Do not permit a building taller than mid-rise on the Estonian House for slope stability reasons
- Do not permit or present tall buildings as an option on Broadview Avenue because the infrastructure cannot support this intensification
- Move forward with the modified mid-rise option for Character Zone D (Option 2)
- The Dairy Queen site is too small to accommodate even a mid-rise building
- Move forward with the modified mid-rise option for the Dairy Queen site in Character Zone C
- Acknowledge the possibility that over the long term, land may be assembled into larger blocks leading to a more consistent streetscape
- Have regard for low-rise homes on adjacent streets

B. Public Realm Options and Priorities

- Provide more public gathering spaces in the community (e.g., the municipally owned laneway located by the auto body shop is a prime location for redevelopment)
- Happy to see more trees and greenspace included in the streetscape images
- Revise the Streetscape Options slide so the area in front of the Minto Skyy building is not labelled as “generous front yard landscaping” because there is no space for additional landscaping

- Ensure open spaces are protected from tall buildings towering over them and that views are protected

C. Transportation Options

- Consider reversible lanes on Broadview Avenue to accommodate rush-hour traffic
- Recognize that traffic is diverted to Broadview Avenue when there is a closure on the Don Valley Parkway or reduced subway service
- Consider locating bike lanes on Cambridge Avenue as opposed to on Broadview Avenue

Feedback on the planning study:

- Maintain the Sobey's as a grocery store because it provides a much needed service in the community
- Ensure that all buildings in the community have appropriate rear-setbacks and slope stability
- Complete a transportation study of Broadview Avenue to determine the capacity
- Consider how the anticipated intensification in Character Zones A, B, C, and D will impact all of Broadview Avenue, including Character Zone E (i.e., transportation, water and sewer systems, park and school systems)

Feedback on the planning study process:

- Shorten the timeline for this Planning Study to eliminate opportunities for developers to submit applications in the interim
- Establish working groups for any tall buildings proposed for Broadview Avenue

Appendix A

Meeting Agenda



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Thursday, May 21, 2015

7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Eastminster United Church, 310 Danforth Avenue

Meeting Purpose: 1) Provide an update on the study process and timeline; and 2) Preview and discuss presentation materials 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 #1 Recap, Review and Approval of Meeting #1 Summary**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- 7:15 pm **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 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 based on the analysis and work completed to date?*
- 8:55 pm **Wrap-up and Next Steps**
David Dilks, Facilitator – Lura Consulting
- SAC Meeting #3, June 1st, 7-9 pm *(to be confirmed)*
- Community Consultation Meeting #3, June 17th, 6-9 pm @ Estonian House
- 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. You mentioned in your presentation that you were going to leave Character Zone B as is, yet you are proposing different options. Can you clarify?

A. We heard from some residents that we should merge Character Zone B and Character Zone A. When I said we decided to leave this as is, I meant that we had decided not to merge Zone B with Zone A because the two character zones are quite different.

Q. You said that one option is to add 6-storeys on top of the existing 4-storeys of the Estonian House. Does that mean you are considering a total of 10-storeys here?

A. That is correct.

Q. Are you proposing 10 or 11-storeys at the Estonian House site? The slide indicates 11-storeys.

A. We are not sure exactly how many storeys can fit on the site, but we believe it is between 10 and 11-storeys.

Q. Are you proposing that you can have an 18-storey building on the Estonian House site and an 18-storey building at the Dairy Queen site?

A. As we went through the analysis it was evident that each site has its own set of constraints. It is difficult to have one set of criteria for an entire Character Zone as each site is unique. We might not have one general rule that applies to the entire area in Character Zone C.

Q. At our first SAC meeting I asked if there was a high-rise application on the Sobey's site and you said there is not and now you are showing a tall building there. The Sobey's should be maintained as a grocery store as it serves the community.

A. There is no proposal at the Sobey's site. These are theoretical options. One potential option for that site would be to maintain the Sobey's on the bottom floor and have residential units on the floors above.

Q. Could we be provided with hard copies of this information?

A. Yes. This presentation is still in draft form. The final presentation is always made available on the project website following the Community Consultation Meeting.

C. I prefer the modified mid-rise option for Character Zone D (Option 2) as well as for the Dairy Queen site in Character Zone C.

C. In the presentation you have included the area in front of the Minto Skyy building as an area where you propose “generous front yard landscaping”. I would argue that there is no room for additional landscaping as the building is located very close to the sidewalk.

A. Yes, the building is located close to the sidewalk. This is the kind of feedback the City is looking to gather from residents.

Q. I don’t understand what happened here. Your presentation is very comprehensive, but I am not sure how we got here. None of the options presented maintain the existing building heights. There is no “leave as is” option. Are we supposed to pick from the options you are presenting to us even if we don’t want taller buildings?

A. This analysis was completed based on the feedback we received from stakeholders at the first two Community Consultation Meetings and at the first Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. At the second Community Consultation Meeting we heard from some participants that we should look at tall buildings in Character Zone A. Our analysis involved looking at the sites we think have the potential to accommodate intensification to determine if they are appropriate for taller buildings. As presented, it was concluded that it would not be appropriate to have tall buildings in Character Zone A which is why we are proposing standard mid-rise and modified mid-rise buildings in that zone. We have considered tall buildings, mid-rise buildings and modified mid-rise buildings in each zone to determine which is appropriate.

C. A number of people at the public meeting indicated that they do not want any tall buildings. They want to maintain 4-storey buildings along Broadview Avenue.

Q. Why do we need such a long timeframe for the study to be completed? Can this timeline be shortened? Previously you told us that during a similar process in Leslieville a developer submitted a proposal before the study was complete and the Ontario Municipal Board concluded that the application should be accepted for that reason. Now we have two rezoning applications where this precedent could apply.

A. I am optimistic that we might be able to shorten the timeline. We are trying to get the study complete this year. This is one of 12 studies underway right now. Much of this timeline is reflective of the other work we have underway in City Planning.

A. In terms of applications we received, one came in before the study was initiated so we can’t do anything about the timing there. That being said, they have acknowledged that this study is underway. Regarding the second application, City staff have direction from Council to review the application in the context of this study. The developer wants to work with us.

C. Open spaces should be protected from tall buildings towering over them and you need to make sure that the views you identify are protected.

C. We need to ensure that the buildings in the community have appropriate rear-setbacks. There are number of buildings on Broadview that have slope stability issues. The Estonian House should not have a building taller than mid-rise and attention must be paid to ensuring slope stability.

C. The Dairy Queen site is too small to accommodate even a mid-rise building.

C. I thought the site located at the south-west corner of Broadview Avenue and Pottery Road belonged to 1010 Broadview Avenue. Why have you identified this area as greenspace?

A. To my knowledge that site is owned by 1010 Broadview Avenue. The purpose of study is to identify potential sites for development and how we would like to see these sites redeveloped.

A. We have a number of examples in the City of buildings that were developed in the 1960s and 1970s and have since undergone redevelopment. We want to be prepared for this type of scenario and have principles in place of how we would respond to that type of proposal.

C. Make “do nothing” an option in the presentation.

C. We have to be clear that there is an option of “no change”. When you first presented everything it sounded as though this is what is going to happen. The tone has to change to demonstrate that these are theoretical options.

C. Start the presentation by outlining how this is going to benefit the Broadview area residents. Consider leading with the streetscape and public realm options. Outline that these streetscape improvements can be completed in the short term and that the development will occur over time.

C. There is little attention paid to Character Zone E in this presentation. Consideration must be given to how the anticipated intensification in Zones A, B, C, and D will impact all of Broadview Avenue, including Zone E (i.e., traffic).

C. Include a slide in the presentation that defines what a mid-rise, modified mid-rise and tall building look like (i.e., how many storeys they are).

C. Include lines in the massing diagrams showing what is permitted under the existing zoning.

C. Will this exercise simply make it easier for developers to build taller buildings? After the guidelines are created, developers will know exactly where and what they can build.

A. The purpose of this exercise is to set the parameters and expectation for what would be reasonable (and not reasonable) in terms of intensification along Broadview Avenue. The outcome of this study will help to guide City staff as they review applications. It will also inform residents and developers of what is appropriate and realistic development.

C. Sometimes we feel that the planning decisions are being made without us.

C. We need more gathering spaces in this community (not necessarily parks which are under used). The laneway located by the auto body shop is a prime location for a new public gathering space. If you redevelop that one area correctly, you will have a created the destination for Broadview.

C. I am excited by the changes shown in the streetscape images. These diagrams show more trees and greenspace.

C. With regards to transportation improvements, you might consider having reversible lanes to accommodate rush-hour traffic. We can always tell when the subway is shut down or when the Don Valley Parkway is closed because all the traffic redirects to Broadview Avenue.

Q. What happened to the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines? Those documents outline that the height of buildings should be equal to the street right-of-way (ROW) which is 20 m along Broadview Avenue. This would result in 6-storey mid-rise buildings. Where did the tall buildings in the presentation come from? The tall buildings proposed for Character Zone C set a bad precedent because this is not the development we want to see and it does not fit with the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines.

Q. Why are we locating the tall buildings so far away from the subway? If you want to intensify, why wouldn't it be near the subway? I am not advocating for this type of development, but it doesn't make sense to have the tall buildings located so far from the subway.

C. It is evident that you have done a lot of work, but having so many options creates chaos. Some of the options should be eliminated. Bring the focus back to the principles presented in the Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines.

C. Since Broadview Avenue is the focus of this study you are trying to solve every problem on this one street (i.e., having larger sidewalks, dedicated transit lanes, bike lanes, etc.). Some of these issues can be solved on the neighbouring streets. For example, bike lanes could go on Cambridge Avenue as opposed to Broadview Avenue.

C. Having tall buildings on Broadview Avenue will put a strain on the infrastructure. We are going to experience traffic chaos and increased pressure on our water mains and sewers. This is a good reason not to allow tall buildings on Broadview.

C. I don't understand why the Estonian House would be allowed a bigger footprint than what is shown?

A. It is very unrealistic that a building could be built within that footprint.

Q. How would an 11-storey building on the Estonian House property transition to the houses on Chester Hill? What kinds of step-backs would be required?

A. This is one indication that this is a very constrained site.

Q. Why are we including this as an option in the presentation then?

A. There are some stakeholders interested in tall buildings and we want to be sure that we have done our due diligence.

Q. Can these options be identified as unrealistic in the presentation? It needs to be made clearer that this is both theoretical and unrealistic.

C. I agree that it's a surprise to see high-rise buildings in this presentation.

Q. Is Chester Hill part of the neighbourhood? Are we getting second-class treatment? We don't want to see 10-storey buildings in our backyards. What protection do you have in place for the properties on Chester Hill to ensure they are not towered over by tall buildings?

A. We are taking a consensus-driven approach for this study. If there is consensus that tall buildings should not be located in different Character Zones we will recommend that. We recognize that there are a variety of interests in the community and that is why we have considered different options. One of our challenges is to think about how buildings on Broadview will transition to the low-rise homes on the adjacent streets. Some of these sites may not be deemed appropriate for taller buildings once other site-specific studies are complete. Nothing is set in stone here.

C. The presentation is very clear and concise. Slow down a bit when you are explaining the various options.

C. The massing diagrams are brilliant to help us visualize and understand the different heights.

C. I liked that you showed images from Leslieville in the last Community Consultation Meeting presentation. Include photos/images in this presentation to provide people with a visual of the atmosphere.

C. I agree that the tall buildings option came out of nowhere.

Q. You identified some sites in Character Zone A for development. Is this development planned or are these theoretical sites? Clarify what the sites represent.

A. This is theoretical. We are just looking at the different possibilities.

Q. Is the footprint of the tall buildings smaller than that of the mid-rise buildings? If so, the densities would be the same.

A. No, the footprint is not smaller for tall buildings. As shown in the presentation, the ground floor area (GFA) for the tall buildings in Zone D is between 30,500 m² and 33,000 m². In comparison, the GFA for the mid-rise buildings is between 20,000 m² and 25,000 m².

C. Tall buildings should not be permitted on Broadview then. Increasing the density on Broadview beyond what you would have with mid-rise buildings is too much.

C. Great presentation - very clear and concise.

Q. Do we have an option of saying no to tall buildings? Do we have to vote on it or can we just eliminate it as an option?

A. There is an option to leave as is, or permit mid-rise buildings.

A. I am not sure that we will remove tall buildings completely as an option in the presentation. There are many different interests in the community and we want to illustrate our due diligence to support the conclusions that we come to, such as, that it is difficult, for the most part, to find sites that accommodate tall buildings.

C. The slant of this whole presentation is identifying where developers can come and build tall buildings. This needs to be changed to say that we heard from the community that they don't want tall buildings. You can illustrate that you undertook analysis and based on this, plus the added constraints on infrastructure, it is very unlikely and unrealistic to build tall buildings along Broadview Avenue.

C. You are saying that it is a slim possibility for these tall buildings to be developed, but that message did not come across in the presentation.

Q. Do you have a number for the influx of people that will reside on Broadview as a result of this intensification?

A. This is not within the scope of the study but we acknowledge that this intensification will have impacts on the infrastructure. When a development application is submitted to the City, a study to determine the infrastructure capacity and impacts is required.

C. I enjoyed the presentation.

C. I recommend that you begin the presentation by outlining that the Official Plan designates Broadview as an Avenue and that the study is being complete under the direction of Council. Include a slide illustrating what a developed Avenue" looks like. You need to provide this context at the beginning of each presentation.

C. Make it clear that this was a theoretical study and that developers and the community will have input on what is actually developed.

C. State at the end of the presentation how this work will benefit Broadview area residents. For example, there are opportunities to greatly improve the streetscape.

C. I felt the presentation ended rather lamely. I suggest ending the presentation by returning to the timeline with the commitment to return in the Fall with recommendations with some indications of what issues the final presentation and report will include.

C. I am worried about the transportation impacts and whether there is capacity to absorb all the development. It is not ideal to complete the infrastructure studies on a site-by-site analysis. A transportation study along all of Broadview Avenue should be undertaken to determine the capacity.

C. I understand why you are assuming there will be no development in Character Zone E (not designated as an Avenue), but with the high-rise on Cosburn and Gamble and assuming successful redevelopment in Zones A-D I foresee land assembly and requests for redevelopment in the longer term in Zone E.

A. The message that you have taken away from the presentation is that we are promoting tall buildings. That is not the message we are trying to portray. An individual at the Community Consultation Meeting stood up and stated that we should be considering tall buildings in Character Zone A as it is located near the subway. We also

received a petition asking us to look at possibilities for tall buildings. In order to do our due diligence we looked at that recommendation and came to the conclusion that we can't make tall buildings work in that area.

C. You should have responded to that request by outlining that tall buildings are not part of the plan for this area. The Avenues and Mid-rise Guidelines state that buildings should be as tall as the street ROW.

A. There is no policy in the Official Plan that says you can't have tall building on an Avenue.

Q. Why have you included tall buildings as an option in other character zones if the request was specifically for Zone A?

A. We wanted to consider all options and then state what can and cannot work in each zone. Character Zones C and D already have tall buildings so it makes sense to consider them as an option there.

C. Just because you completed this analysis, doesn't mean you have to present it to the public.

C. If there are going to be taller buildings on Broadview Avenue, you should consider establishing working groups to ensure there is some 'give-and-take'. For example, as part of their proposal, they might be required to include public space.

Q. Are we as stakeholders here tonight going to shape what is being presented in the next public meeting?

There is general consensus that we would like to remove the tall building options from the presentation to the larger group.

A. We will take all this feedback back and will discuss it.

A. Changes will be made to the presentation based on the comments we heard tonight.

C. Who do you need to show your due diligence to: developers or community members?

A. We would like to show our analysis to everyone.

C. It should be made clear that although there are specific sites outlined in the presentation that are able to accommodate tall buildings, the alternatives will be analyzed in the next phase based on criteria such as urban design, community consultation, transportation impact, environmental impact, and the capacity of water and sewer systems that might actually deem these sites as inappropriate for tall buildings.

C. Include the tall building options as an appendix. Start the presentation off by stating that you don't think there are many possibilities for tall buildings within the study area.

C. The community doesn't have a problem with buildings that meet the mid-rise guidelines.

C. Mid-rise buildings should be the default option. It should be communicated that without any other reason not to, we are going to move forward with the mid-rise option.

Q. Are there any other designated Avenues in the area?

A. Yes, Pape, Danforth and Broadview are all designated as Avenues in the Official Plan.

C. We should look at Broadview in the context of the broader community. Broadview Avenue doesn't have to solve everything.

C. Parking on Broadview Avenue is essential. If you are going to remove on street parking, you should consider the option of having developers provide public parking.

A. We generally don't encourage additional parking above and beyond what is required under the bylaw.

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. When the term “greenery” is used to describe plantings that participants would like to see in places along Broadview, that the greenery chosen next to the valley areas be indigenous to the area.

C. There are already too many high-rises surrounding the natural area. We favour mid-rise not high-rise near the valley. There should be proper setbacks from the slopes including for underground parking. This is not a trivial request. In the past, filling the slopes for building purposes has created unnatural steepening and with heavy rainstorms we have had landslides into the valley behind some of the buildings. This has occurred in many places throughout the city. See the urban principal guidelines in the attachment included.

C. Some participants at the public meeting mentioned they would like to see improved access to Todmorden and the Valley. Recently in 2011 Pottery Road was reconstructed and a wider access path was created to accommodate pedestrians and uphill cyclists in order to improve access. The stairs that go down to the site from about halfway down on this path need some repairs. They are closed in the winter months for safety reasons as they are not maintained during the winter. More information about these stairs can be found from the Todmorden Mills Museum staff.

C. Some participants asked that views be preserved and there is a map showing these places. Some of the places on the map are on private property. It is important to note that the Wildflower Preserve and the 22 acres it encompasses are part of the city park system. The city has goals of increasing the urban tree canopy, and protecting natural spaces including ravines. These goals are outlined in the Official Plan and in more detail in the Parks Plan 2013-2017 and the Forestry Plan 2012-2022. What constitutes a “view” today might be a different “view” 25 years from now because plants grow over time. Growing trees and plants must not be harmed to preserve a “view” that exists at a certain moment in time. Interestingly, at the end of Chester Hill Road there is a view that will remain open because of the Don Valley Parkway. It should be promoted in the neighbourhood. Here is a link to a very interesting film about this: spacing.ca/toronto/2013/08/27/spacing-films-chester-hill-lookout/

C. New buildings must include exercise areas for dogs. The nearby natural valley at Todmorden and vicinity cannot sustain more demand for this type of use. The Preserve is not a designated off leash area but it and the surrounding area near the bike paths are increasingly used in this way and conflicts are increasing.

C. Some participants asked that Noise Pollution be considered during planning, and to that we would like to add Light Pollution – far too much night lighting near natural areas where the facility is not open at that time, and too much lighting in general in the city.

C. The design principles outlined on the attachment “Urban Design Principles” are examples of planning that take nature into consideration for a greener, and healthier city. More details pertaining to the Don Valley in particular can be found in the document Bringing Back the Don commissioned by the Task Force to Bring Back the Don, by Hough, Stansbury and Woodland from 1991. It is still relevant, indeed, more relevant today. These principles we hope will be used in the Broadview study.

C. Include a slide illustrating the sort of development provided for by the existing by-law, the point being that redevelopment is taking place under the planning regime in place today. This would in fact be “the do nothing option”.

C. When presenting the redevelopment potential of the various sites I think you should emphasise that your analysis was conceptual and theoretical with a view of establishing the maximum permitted density on each site.

C. Incorporate the development potential of the area using the existing zoning as well as mid-rise alternatives.

C. If you define your study as theoretical, I have no problem with you presenting the development potential of tall buildings on the larger sites as long as you clearly state that the alternatives will be analysed in the next phase based on criteria such as urban design, community consultation, transportation impact, environmental impact, and the capacity of water and sewer systems.

C. Given that there was a specific request to look at tall buildings in Zone A at the public meeting I think you should respond to that request with your analysis and conclusion.

C. I was surprised that application of the “Avenue Guidelines” resulted in buildings of 8 to 11 storeys. Intuitively from an urban design perspective this seems a bit high. I would have thought 6 to 7 storeys would be better. I fear 8-11 storeys would result in a canyon effect, especially when combined with my next point. I would be interested in what your urban design team has to say about that.

C. Your theoretical analysis only dealt with sites where mid-rise developments are possible today because of size and location. But somewhere I think you should acknowledge the possibility that over the long term, land may be assembled into larger blocks leading to a more consistent streetscape.

C. I do not know how much development potential analysis the theoretical analysis results in. I am going to guess five times the existing development. This does not frighten me because I understand the City and the people who live in the City are changing and will live their lives differently to today. But I would like to see

some discussion of the impacts of this amount of developments on Transportation, water and sewer, park and school systems. It is fine to put that analysis off to the next phase but it should be done.

C. I liked the idea raised last night of adding at the end of the presentation a two or three slides of illustrations of what is in it for Broadview and the surrounding neighbourhood. More people=more life and vivacity=greater variety of shops and services. The greater probability of keeping Sobeys. The greater probability of keeping local schools open. Wider and better sidewalks=greater walkability. The potential to connect to the city-wide cycle system. Two messages that resonated for me at last night's meeting were, "Broadview cannot solve all our problems" such as the suggestion that Cambridge could be used by cyclists was constructive, and "We should look at Broadview in the context of the broader community". Opportunities that redevelopment creates are also important (e.g. making much better use of the alley way between Broadview and Cambridge was raised; there may be others).

C. Stick to selling one vision: the avenues plan with mid-rise guidelines that outlines the street ROW = height of building. Too many options will confuse people as they won't know what the proposal is.

C. Think Broader than Broadview for bicycles. Sharrows with traffic and buses would be terrifying for cyclists on Broadview and unnecessary. See the attached for how to handle an easy bike path from Mortimer to Danforth.

C. If there is going to be a tall building in Character Zone A, which I believe is where the person asking about it is located, then the logical place to do due diligence is the area south of the alley. A building taller than mid-rise should come with strings: 1) the auto body shop should be included in the land, 2) the city-owned strip of land should be swapped into square space to allow the building to connect with former auto body building 3) the alley becomes a pedestrian zone (no car access from Broadview; only from Cambridge and even then only for parking of the homeowners on Cambridge and retail deliveries), 4) garbage to the curb and no parking garage (instead the underground should be a tunnel heading straight south to Broadview subway).

C. Clearly a significant amount of work has gone into the planning effort since the previous Community meeting, but the apparent change in scope was completely unexpected. As discussed following the presentations, all of us on the SAC came into this under the auspices of an Avenue Plan, where Midrise development was the mandate. The City has indicated to us a strategy of higher density on specific major arteries, and Midrise development on routes designated as Avenues, with the enabling of appropriate densification within clearly specified limitations (or so we were led to believe), and the preservation and enhancement of adjacent neighbourhoods. Key items indicated to the area residents in the planning documentation have been associated with compatibility with existing built form, and suitable transition between Avenue developments and adjacent neighbourhoods.

C. The attention to "neighbourhood" is a key area of relevance to all of us who live in the "neighbourhoods". As all of you are well aware, those of us along Broadview feel that there are some anomalous areas which warrant appropriate attention - the potential for deeper penetration of "Avenue" lands is a huge concern, and the City seemed to be offering full support for a massive impact to specific "neighbourhood" locations, potentially

discarding the level of protection afforded to homes backing to the east, when showing us the possible "Avenue" development impact to homes which are currently deep in the neighbourhood (54-72 Chester Hill Road in particular).

C. The presentation of high-rise development options was a huge surprise to all of us when we are purportedly present to participate in a midrise planning study. As it was made clear that new developments are being directed to comply with current planning study guidelines, the presentation of high-rise options would certainly seem to be a rubber stamp to ditching the midrise concept for the sites identified in the presentation for high-rise development. So too, the concept of taking 958 Broadview to 18 storeys, or even to 11/12 Storeys, would certainly appear to discard all of the 20m midrise concepts proposed as the maximum height for development, and as this would be a stepped back development, it would clearly be throwing the homes along Chester Hill into the dumpster, in terms of abandoning any concept of transition with a support for an 11/12 storey (40m) flat wall at the rear of their properties.

C. It was indicated that we all have the right to push to have no changes to area zoning, and if the community considered that appropriate, the City would support this. I suggest that abandoning the core concepts which we were provided with at the beginning of this effort would certainly seem to be akin to waving a red flag, to which area residents may begin to feel that walking away from such a planning effort is our only option.

C. It was also indicated that the high-rise development proposals were undertaken based upon the requests from one participant at the last Community meeting, and also, that they were undertaken based upon the receipt of a petition from property owners/developers. When SAC members then queried about what level of signatures on a petition from area residents would be required to have a weight similar to that of a few investors/developers, we were told that the planning department does not actually pay attention to petitions. Clearly, from the statements made, there are some inconsistencies in this realm.

C. It was also stated that the options presented were part of a due diligence study to see what could be done on some of the properties, for completeness of the study, but again, this is a Midrise plan (or so we were told), so the concept of putting up high-rise buildings, based solely upon the lot size, could be achieved by any developer who chose to purchase a sufficient number of properties, and thus, the mere concept of any of the larger lots being possible locations for high-rises would tend to imply that the midrise plan is rather toothless. Surely a sanctioned plan approved by the City, with buy-in from the Province, would be able to hold some measure of credibility at OMB, and at City level, there should be no reason for support/approval of high-rise construction along corridors tagged for midrise development.

C. The concern regarding developers extending the "Avenue" designation merely by expanding back into the residential realm is remains unanswered. A band along Broadview which is "Avenue" makes sense, and land behind this line should be tagged as "Neighbourhood". Otherwise, what is to stop developers from changing their situation by merely buying out a few homeowners?

C. Traffic planning remains a critical area as well. With the ravine on one side, we do not have the through access which a more normal area would have, and the limited access to specific portions of this neighbourhood necessitates special regulations on key streets. The presence of significant high-rises within existing neighbourhoods already results in significantly higher pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic than would be the case in the area to the west of Broadview (a simpler single family dwelling neighbourhood). The impact to this 1970's area should also be given consideration when looking at the impact of further densification. The traffic flow restrictions on Pretoria, Cambridge at Danforth, and Chester Hill Road all work well together (and have for the past 30+ years). City regulations mandating the use of side streets for new developments, and indeed, planning study allowances for building density on key arteries, should be reviewed to ensure that a fragile balance is not broken and discarded merely for the maximization of density on all locations. I believe that we the area residents would be willing to accept a few higher density locations mid-block in return for lower density locations on key corners. Locations such as Erindale are a prime example of a situation where there could be a huge impact on TTC and area traffic if a significant midrise development were to go in, with Erindale tagged for primary access and egress, so there is clearly a need for the City to think outside the box along this stretch of Broadview.

C. Provide a brief historical perspective on the intensification process in the presentation. Outline that the Provincial initiative dates back to 2006 and that the intention of the legislation is to protect the greenspaces and farmland within the Greater Golden Horseshoe as well as prevent urban sprawl, and all of the environmental problems associated with sprawl.