

City of Toronto

**Highland Creek  
Transportation Master Plan  
Public Information Centre #1  
Consultation Summary Report**

# Table of Contents

	page
<b>Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Stakeholder Walkshop.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Public Information Centre 1 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre.....	2
PIC Format.....	2
Summary of Stakeholder Feedback .....	4
<b>What's Next? .....</b>	<b>7</b>

# Overview

The City of Toronto has initiated a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to identify and evaluate transportation needs to support all road users and the further development of Highland Creek Village as a vibrant and mixed-use community. Once complete, the TMP will recommend a set of transportation projects, initiatives and policies which support re-development, improve transportation flow and address the needs of the community and all road users.

This report summarizes the comments received leading up to, during and after the Public Information Centre 1 held on June 25, 2014.

The study is following a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process, which includes identifying the problem/opportunity, developing and evaluating a reasonable range of alternative solutions, and providing opportunities for public input.

## Stakeholder Walkshop

City staff held a WalkShop on June 5, 2014, to solicit feedback from local stakeholders representing a variety of interests (i.e., businesses, residents, community groups, institutions, property owners, and faith groups) with regards to the existing transportation problems and future opportunities in the study area. Specifically, input from the participants was sought in relation to potential improvements to the area's roadway network, pedestrian environment, streetscaping, cycling network connections, on-street parking and transit.

The WalkShop provided an important opportunity to inform the study team of existing issues and concerns in advance of the first Public Information Centre (PIC). In general, feedback received at the WalkShop comprised varying opinions related to the transportation problems in Highland Creek Village. However, a common view that opportunities for revitalization, including continuous sidewalks, streetscaping, improving safety for all road users, and supporting local businesses was also noted amongst the WalkShop participants.

An invitation to participate in the WalkShop was issued to selected local stakeholders, including participants of the Highland Creek Village Area Study Working Group, in the study area on May 20, 2014. In total, fifteen (15) respondents participated in the WalkShop. Study team members were present at the workshop to lead individual groups throughout the study area, discuss key areas and document feedback. A comment sheet was also distributed to WalkShop participants.

# Public Information Centre 1

Public Information Centre (PIC) 1 was held at the Royal Canadian Legion on June 25, 2014. The purpose of the PIC was to introduce the study and present and seek public input on existing conditions, the Problem and Opportunity Statement, the preliminary alternatives developed to address the transportation needs for the Highland Creek Village area and the criteria to be used to evaluate the alternative solutions.

## Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre

### Public Notice

The Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre (PIC) 1 was posted on the City's website on June 11, 2014. In addition, the notice was posted in the Scarborough Mirror East newspaper on June 12 and 19, 2014.

### Mail Distribution

The notice was distributed via standard mail delivery to agencies, residents, businesses and property owners situated within and surrounding the study area on June 12, 2014. The limits of distribution generally included properties located within the boundaries of Centennial Road to the east, Lawrence Avenue East to the south, Morningside Avenue to the west and Highway 401 to the north.

### Study Website

A website was established on June 10, 2014, to provide information related to the study, including notices, background information, updates, and links to other relevant information.

## PIC Format

The PIC was arranged in an open house, drop-in format and included a formal presentation, question/answer session, idea rating exercise and "breakout session". The open house provided an opportunity for attendees to review a series of display material and participate in other activities offered as part of the PIC, as described below. Attendees were also encouraged to provide written comments at and/or following the PIC.

### Presentation

A half hour presentation was offered by members of the study team at 6:30 pm. The presentation provided more detailed information related to the format of the PIC, the Class Environmental Assessment process and the preliminary alternatives being considered as part of this study.

### Question and Answer Session/Comment Cards

Immediately following the presentation, attendees were encouraged to submit written questions or statements on a designated comment/question card which were read at the microphone by staff. Select cards that represented popular themes were first read. Comment/question cards

were used instead of a traditional open microphone in order for the study team to hear from those who are not as comfortable with public speaking (about 75% of the general population) and to receive the most amount of feedback in a limited time frame. In total, sixty-three (63) comment forms were received at the PIC.

### **Breakout Sessions**

Given the focused interest in selected areas of the study, three “breakout sessions” were organized following the question and answer period. Members of the study team dispersed amongst tables to facilitate discussion related to parking, the Meadowvale/Highway 2 connection and land use. Study team members were available to answer questions and listen to the key concerns raised.

### **Comment Sheet**

A comment sheet was provided at the PIC which posed a series of questions related to the study. Specifically, the following questions were posed as part of the comment sheet:

1. What improvements to transit, walking and/or cycling would you like to see?
2. What do you like about the three preliminary alternatives being considered?
3. What do you not like about the three preliminary alternatives being considered?
4. Are there other road network improvement needs that should be considered in the Highland Creek Village TMP? Why?
5. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Thirty (30) comment sheets were received at/following the PIC.

### **Idea Rating Sheet**

Idea Rating Sheets were provided as part of the PIC to solicit feedback from attendees in relation to specific alternatives developed by members of the study team. Participants were also invited to post their own ideas and suggestions to address problems and opportunities in the study area, and subsequently rate and provide comment on each of the Idea Rating Sheets.

In total, twenty-eight (28) idea rating sheets with rating options were on display during the PIC. Most ideas were written down by people who attended the meeting. The ranking options ranged from strong agreement to strong disagreement, and/or confusion. For each option attendees were also asked to note the strengths and weaknesses they saw for each idea. All ideas have been included in the summary. A scanned copy of the idea rating sheets received is available on the project website for reference.

Please note that sheets captured a sample of active participants. Sheets that included opinions from 15 or more participants were considered representative of the larger audience.

In summary, key responses indicated the following:

While there are differing opinions on many of the alternatives presented, the Highland Creek Village community clearly wants to be involved in the conversation about transportation and future development. People generally agree on improvements to sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and

streetscaping. There are conflicting opinions on connecting Meadowvale and strong concerns about removing angled parking on Old Kingston Road.

### **Key Points**

- Differing and strong views on connecting Meadowvale through to 2A/Kingston Road or further south to Lawson Road:
  - Split between strong agreement (14) and disagreement (15) to connect to 2A via a westbound right turn only
  - Split between strong agreement (12) and strong disagreement (15) opening up Meadowvale through to Lawson
  - Request (9) to add "Option 4" which considers improvements without changes to Meadowvale
- Strong support (20) to keep angled parking to maintain convenience and number of parking spots for both residents and businesses and maintains Village character while some disagree (7) based largely on safety concerns and long-term development opportunities for additional
  - Strong support for additional off street parking
- Strong support for sidewalks (atleast on one side but preferably on both sides of street) throughout Village and Study Area
- Strong support for bicycle facilities (bike lanes) and infrastructure (racks) in Village
- Strong disagreement (16) with some agreement (8) for roundabout at Kingston Road and Lawson Road intersection
- Many people (12) find connections with University important (i.e. bike racks, cycling infrastructure, public transit, & attracting students to Village) and some (4) do not
- Public realm (e.g.) is important people. Requests for more green space, trees, and space for pedestrian traffic.
- Differing and strong views on "Keeping the Village as it is with no changes". Note that those who don't want change do want improvements for businesses who need customers
- Requests (22) to open up study area up to Ellesmere in order to consider Meadowvale option and University of Toronto Scarborough campus.

### **Summary of Stakeholder Feedback**

PIC 1 was well attended by members of the community who expressed their interest in supporting the well-being of Highland Creek Village residents and business owners. In total, 119 people signed in to the PIC. Participants were invited to record their "stakeholder type" (i.e., local resident, business owner, developer, commuter, etc.) and "mode of travel" through the Village (i.e., walk, cycle, auto, etc.) on a comment form. Based on the input received, the majority of attendees were local residents who lived within a 10 minute walk of the Highland Creek Village area. In addition, many attendees generally indicated that they travel to and/or through the area several times per week. It was further noted that the automobile was the most used mode of travel. However, walking and cycling are also commonly used modes of travel in the study area.

Comments received at and/or following the PIC are generally summarized below and include feedback/responses received during the Question and Answer Session, on the comment forms and sheets collected at/following the PIC, via discussion between study team members and

attendees during the PIC and email correspondence received following the PIC. It should be noted that a 'Frequently Asked Questions' document is being generated to address the key question and concerns raised by respondents. This document will be available on the study website.

### **Pedestrians**

- Overall support of need for sidewalk improvements
- Incorporate sidewalks along all roadways and/or on both sides of roadways in area
- Improve signal timings at pedestrian crossings
- Provide more sidewalks to improve pedestrian safety

### **Cycling**

- Suggestion that existing bicycle lanes in area are not used sufficiently
- Suggestions to include:
  - Bicycle parking in the Village area
  - Cycling lanes through Village
  - Separated bike lanes

### **Transit**

- Overall need to consider impacts to transit users during study (i.e., affects to bus routes/public transit)
- Suggestion to improve access to subway routes
- Suggestions to provide link to the University of Toronto (Scarborough Campus)

### **Roundabout**

- Safety concerns associated with pedestrian and cyclist use of roundabouts
- Roundabout navigation concerns for motorists, pedestrian and cyclists
- Some preference for roundabouts over stop lights

### **Road Network**

#### Proposed Meadowvale Road Connection

- Agree that connection will improve traffic flow and reduce traffic on related section on Highway 2A
- Possible speeding and associated safety concerns for nearby residents and school children
- Concerns associated with potential to:
  - Impact physical property
  - Create divide between existing community
  - Increase traffic volumes on Meadowvale and associated impacts to area residents
  - Preferred by some and recognized as "missing link" in existing network

#### Lawson Road Overpass

- Supported by some as improvement to existing network
- Concerns that costs and recent rehabilitation of bridge preclude need to remove structure

- Concerns that new traffic signals create additional congestion and delays to traffic along Highway 2A
- Suggestion to improve signage for bridge ramps to Highway 2A

#### Deep Deen Drive

- Concern related to excessive traffic along roadway during peak hours
- Suggestion to extend Deep Dene Drive south to Lawson Road

#### **Cultural Environment**

- Concerns associated with potential to:
  - Impact mature trees along Meadowvale Road
  - Alter traditional appearance of village (removal of angled parking)
  - Impact character of area surrounding Meadowvale Road

#### **Parking**

- Suggestions to add new off-street parking facilities/lots (Green P)
- Concern there may be existing lack of convenient parking
- Concerns associated with proposed reconfiguration of angled parking include:
  - Potential to impact accessibility of Village for seniors
  - Navigational challenges associated with parallel parking
  - Will change "Village Character"
- Support for parallel parking attributed mainly to improving safety
- Suggestion for more consultation with local businesses on this issue

#### **Economic Environment**

- Potential for revised parking configuration to impact business operations in the village area
- Potential to decrease property values in association with Meadowvale Road connection

#### **Other Suggestions**

- Leave existing transportation environment 'as is'
- Convert Watson Street to one-way roadway
- Consider impacts of nearby developments (i.e., Pan Am Games, U of T Scarborough campus) on future traffic conditions/this study
- Concerns related to development and land use planning (building heights, street/property configuration, zoning, etc.)
- Concern that there is not a need for two stoplights at Kingston Road between Military Trail and Lawson Road
- Avoid need for more traffic lights in area
- Direct traffic around Village



## What's Next?

- Review and consider comments received at/following PIC #1
- Develop 'Frequently Asked Questions' document and post on study website (September 2014)
- Finalize and evaluate the alternative long term network solutions (Fall 2014)
- Identify water, wastewater, and stormwater functional servicing requirements
- Develop transportation policies and standards (Fall 2014)
- Hold PIC #2 to present draft Transportation Master Plan recommendations (January 2015)
- Develop implementation and funding plan to support the recommendations